Practicing the preaching?

A study of the Transition Movement in Norway and its effort to change energy-related practices

Ingerid Salvesen

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Philosophy in Culture, Environment and Sustainability

Centre for Development and the Environment

University of Oslo

Blindern, Norway

14.11.2014

Abstract

In Norway, a vast majority of the population supports scientific findings of climate change. At the same time, Norway´s emissions are increasing, while support for the environmental movement is decreasing. One might ask why the population is not more engaged in doing its part? A comparative case study of two groups of the Transition Movement, a community-based social movement rather new to Norway, aims to shed light on this. This study examines how and why the two biggest Transition groups in Norway have formed and mobilized participants, as well as whether, how and why participation in the groups contributes to changing social practices in order to reduce energy-related consumption and thus potentially the environmental strain of everyday life. Applying social practice theory and social movement theory, I have analysed findings for each of the two groups exclusively, as well as across both cases, enabling insight into the formation and the results of the Transition Movement in Norway in general, but also into local variations and the factors explaining these variations. Key findings are that the groups create places where participants invent and facilitate alternative consumption practices, demonstrating an original way of engaging citizens in reducing the energy intensity of their consumption; in many ways the opposite of what energy efficiency and consumption policies have prescribed the latter years. However, there are current limitations to the potential effect of the TM groups' approaches, particularly in reaching out to a broader group of society, and in confronting material barriers that the groups unlikely can dismantle on their own.

Keywords: sustainable consumption, energy savings, social practices, social movements, social change, climate change, Transition Movement.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

BLL Bærekraftige Liv på Landås

CISE Community Innovation in Sustainable Energy

EEA European Environmental Agency

FIVH Fremtiden i våre hender

IEA International Energy Agency

IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

MDG Miljøpartiet De Grønne

NMF Norges Miljøvernforbund

NNV Norges Naturvernforbund

NSM New Social Movement theory

NU Natur og Ungdom

OECD Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

OS Omstilling Sagene

PP Political Process theory

RM Resource Mobilization theory

SMT Social Movement theory

SPT Social Practice theory

TIR Telemark Research Institute

TM Transition Movement

UFF U-landshjelp fra Folk til Folk

UK United Kingdom

USA United States of America

WWF World Wildlife Fund

Acknowledgements

This thesis, while holding my name, is the making of a large number of people. I would like to thank my supervisor Harold Wilhite, for his encouragement and intelligent guidance throughout. I would also like to thank Tor Håkon Inderberg, without whose immense support and skillfull advice I would have been lost. To great colleagues at Fridtjof Nansen Institute where I was lucky enough to spend most of my writing period: Thanks for keeping my brain filled with intelligent discussions, and my blood filled with caffeine.

This thesis is written in cooperation with the research project Energy Savings – from Regulation to Realisation (ESPARR), financed by the Norwegian Research Council. I am grateful to the researchers of ESPARR for including me and my thesis in the project. I am also grateful to Per I. Haukeland and Bent A. Brandtzæg at Telemark Research Institute for the cooperation on the surveys, and to Anne-Line Sandåker for her patience and care for all SUM-students, myself included.

I would also like to thank friends and family for cheering, Marte for making my writing understandable, Solveig for stepping in at last minute and Øyvind for helping me understand my own arguments, improving them (and generally, me) for the better. Also, a shout-out to Karen O'Brien: Hopefully, everyone is fortunate enough to have that one lecturer in university that manages to open your eyes and get you completely hooked on a topic. She was that one for me.

Most of all, I am indebted to the participants in Omstilling Sagene and Bærekraftige Liv på Låndås: Thank you for opening your homes, including me in your activities, spending of your time and sharing with me your insights, thoughts, hopes, fears and commitment to working for a better world. When writing got tough I thought of you and your approach, which we all can learn from: Go ahead, just do it.

Ingerid Salvesen, Fridtjof Nansen Institute, 14th November 2014

1. Introduction

After decades of research on global environmental change, and especially climate change, the greatest unanswered question is not any longer whether and how our ecosystems and societies *will* be affected, but rather, of which the last years of stalemate in the international climate negotiations is a testament: *what to do about it.* How do we mitigate and adapt to climate change? How do we transform our societies and systems to become more sustainable and resilient? Who gets to decide how and when?

Despite the growing recognition in science and politics as well as public opinion of how human actions are intertwined both globally and within the natural system, there is a failure to agree within and between countries on such questions. Frustrated by the lack of agreement and substantial change, the founders of a rather new community-based social movement called Transition Movement claim that it is collective local action that must and can "change the world" (Hopkins[1] 2013:11). The movement aims to mobilize action in communities worldwide to address what they call 'the twin challenges' of climate change and depletion of cheap energy. Their approach is unconventional in that it is neither based on information-campaigns for the public nor lobbying or protesting politicians or institutions; instead they simply launch activities in their local areas. These are both directed towards reducing carbon emissions from the communities involved, and towards fostering public engagement and empowerment around climate change. The movement seeks to institutionalize new low-carbon social practices and social norms and thus contribute to a transition to low-carbon economies (Transition Network 2013a). Their key rational is: "If we wait for the governments, it'll be too little, too late. If we act as individuals, it'll be too little. But if we act as communities, it might just be enough, just in time" (Hopkins 2013:45). Community action is seen as "the missing piece" (ibid).

[1] Rob Hopkins is co-founder of Transition Network and the initiator behind the first Transition group, Transition Town Totnes.

The movement has grown rapidly across the world, receiving increasing attention from scholars and policymakers. It is both criticized for being politically naïve and utopian (Trapese 2008) and cheered for providing alternative and innovative ways for engaging citizens in reducing carbon emissions (Reeves et al 2013). This thesis seeks to engage both views. I will provide a comparative case study, examining whether this movement successfully mobilizes citizens and contributes to change practices of energy-related consumption in Norway, a country where the movement has so far received little attention by scholars and policymakers. If the movement does contribute to change, it can be argued that more attention should be given to its approaches.

1.1 Research questions

This comparative study will examine through which mechanisms the two biggest Transition initiatives in Norway form and mobilize participants, and whether and how participation in the groups contribute to changing social practices and potentially form new norms concerning energy-related consumption. This dual focus is set out of the conviction that whatever results can be gained by mobilizing new constituencies, it holds little importance from an environmental point of view if participation does not lead to the actual reduction of high-carbon consumption as the movement aims for. Likewise, changing practices and forming new norms holds little importance if these norms and practices remain within a small number of people and fail to mobilize additional participants. This study is thus both exploratory, as it seeks to gain new knowledge about how the Transition Movement in Norway works and what it leads to, and explanatory, as it seeks to understand and explain why and how it leads to this. The purpose is to increase our understanding of if and how local grassroots social movements may contribute to a wider

transformation towards a more environmentally sustainable low-carbon society.

This thesis will examine the following two research questions:

1. *How and why have the two biggest Transition initiatives in Norway formed and through which mechanisms and strategies do they mobilize participants?*
2. *How and why are new energy-related consumption practices developed and old ones changed or not, within the two groups?*

The examination of 'energy-related' consumption is here conducted through studying consumption practices with significant energy and environmental consequences, and the norms embedded in these practices. Three clusters of energy-related practices are chosen for consideration: food, transport and clothing[2]. Such a broad scope risks compromising an in-depth understanding of the different practices and related norms, yet the justification is twofold. Firstly, several scholars have argued that to prevent fragmentation of consumption policies, researchers (and policymakers) should focus on clusters of consumption practices "situated within a limited number of 'domains' spanning everyday life" (Spaargaren 2013:234, see also Hargreaves 2011). Food, clothing and transport are all examples of such domains, in which practices are reproduced under the influence of shared rules specific for each domain (Spaargaren 2013). Secondly, the activities of the two Transition groups in question are not many for each cluster of practices. It would therefore be difficult to ensure a solid empirical data collection if the study were to focus only on one or two of them.

Some definitions of central terms as they are employed in this thesis should be provided. How exactly to define 'sustainability' has been heavily

[2] I explain the rationale for choosing these three clusters of practices and their energy and environmental consequences in chapter 2.2.

discussed and contested within policy and research, and most definitions tend to be vague (McNeill 2006). The key idea, however, is to break the former separation of the economic, the environmental and the social objectives of a policy, and to include the generational perspective (Carter 2007). By 'sustainable consumption' I therefore refer to consumption that simultaneously fulfil human needs across time and space and protect the natural environment – simplified, that is low carbon consumption. I adopt Wilhite's definition of consumption as "the acquisition and use of things" (Wilhite 2008:3), where "things" refer to goods, technologies and products, and add to it the acquisition and use of also services, plus the maintenance and disposal of both things and services (Campbell 1995:102). Acquisition, use, maintenance and disposal all constantly influence the other, and the Transition Movement work with all processes. Including services to the definition is also relevant as much of the Transition groups' activities involve services like repairing or using collective transport.

1.2 The potential of bottom-up movements for reducing energy-related consumption

The weight of scientific analysis concur that our global society will need to undergo deep economic and social changes if we are to effectively mitigate and adapt to the potentially dramatic consequences of climate change (IPCC 2007, IPCC 2013). This will require substantial and sustained reductions of greenhouse gas emissions (ibid)[3]. Despite the international agreements on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and limiting the average global temperature increase to 2 degrees Celsius (°C), the governments of the world are today far from reaching this set target (IEA 2013). The international

[3] The IPCC fourth assessment report (2007) stated that developed countries would have to reduce their emissions by 25-40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 in order to reach the 2 °C target, and that also developing countries would need to reduce their business-as-usual trajectories substantially.

negotiations have been in a political deadlock (Baer et al 2012). The attention towards action at local and municipal level is increasing (Bulkeley and Kern 2006).

Energy is imperative for this challenge. The global energy sector, dominated by fossil fuels, is responsible for two-thirds of total greenhouse gas emissions (IEA 2013)[4]. This has made many argue for a necessary transition to low-carbon energy systems, but also for an overall reduction in energy use (e.g. Stern 2007). The latter is seen as increasingly relevant as projections from the International Energy Agency (IEA) implies that the transition from fossil fuel- to renewable-based energy production will not happen fast enough to reduce emissions significantly the coming decades (Wilhite 2012). Energy savings or -efficiency, using less energy to achieve the same or better level of services (Stephenson et al 2010), is not only described as an effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but also as one of the most cost-effective measures to address current and anticipated energy supply constraints (IEA 2009).

At the same time, a vast number of the Earth's population still lack access to basic energy services, meaning that likely there will be a dramatic increase in energy use and accompanying greenhouse gas emissions in the global South the coming years, as emerging economies develop infrastructure and basic services to an increasing part of their inhabitants. Arguing against this type of energy growth is neither ethical nor practical, and so the onus for major reductions in energy use is placed on affluent, industrialized countries (Wilhite and Norgard 2004, IPCC 2007). Yet governments have struggled to design effective energy efficiency policies. Wilhite and Norgard (2004:992) argue that policymakers in OECD countries seem to suffer from a self-deception in their energy policies, which equates 'efficiency' in technology

[4] Its emissions are also growing faster than those of any other sector (IEA 2009).

and markets with ‘reduction’ and ‘sustainability’ in energy use. The authors challenge what they see as a dominant idea related to the environmental impact of human activity; that efficiency measures in production and consumption technology will be enough to solve the sustainability challenge (ibid, see also Hille et al 2008). Although the last decades have seen significant gains in energy efficiency through technological innovation, the total energy demand and use has only increased in most modern, industrialized societies—outweighing the efficiency gains (Wilhite et al 2000, EEA 2012).

Policymakers have responded to the challenge by attempting to promote less energy-intensive consumption, emphasizing approaches like providing information to the public. The results, however, have so far been few. Several scholars (e.g. Shove et al. 1998, Hargreaves 2011) argue that the lack of success is due to the narrow view of social change underlying contemporary consumption and energy savings policies, being based on simplistic linear models of human behavior: The assumption that ‘information leads to change in attitude leads to change in action’ has been largely rejected by research on sustainable consumption, which suggests that also social, material, cultural and institutional factors influence our consumption patterns and choices (e.g. Shove et al 1998, Wilhite et al 2000). From this perspective, energy-related consumption will not change if approached only at an individual level, because it is embedded in a larger system of social norms, cultural values, material conditions and institutional infrastructure.

This is where Seyfang et al (2010) see the potential of civil society, including grassroots social movements like the Transition Movement, as a change catalyst. The authors argue that “behavior change will likely occur in the context of changing values, lifestyles, and cultural norms modulated through social contexts, including social movements” (2010:4), and that civil society consequently may prove imperative for so-called ‘energy transitions’. The latter concept builds on literature developed around ‘sustainability

transitions'; looking at past societal transitions and trying to understand how industrialized societies can achieve more sustainable development pathways through technical and social innovation (Seyfang et al 2010). However, until recently this literature also concentrated mainly on technological efficiency innovations in "supply-side issues such as energy generation and infrastructure, focusing on technology producers and intermediaries, businesses and government actors" (ibid:3). Several scholars have argued that more attention must be given to factors and mechanisms that can influence and transform the other side of energy and energy-related consumption: the demand—at individual, household and community level (ibid, Wilhite et al 2000). Scholars also underline the need to better understand the potential roles of civil society groups alongside state and market actors in developing sustainable energy systems (Seyfang et al. 2010, Hargreaves et al. 2011, Hielscher et al. 2011, Foxon 2011).

This thesis seeks to build on these perspectives and study initiatives of the Transition Movement in Norway. In a country where the majority of households' direct energy use is hydro-powered and thus perceived by a majority of inhabitants as clean and in abundance (Karlstrøm et al 2013), the movement has instead focused on the energy use of our mobility practices and the indirect energy use embedded in the consumption of products. As one of a growing number of bottom-up initiatives from civil society which are confronting the links between climate change, fossil fuels and high-carbon lifestyles (North 2011), I will argue that the Transition Movement represents an interesting angle from which to explore the critique of current consumption and energy saving policies in the global North and to look for alternative recipes: The movement seeks to implement a method which differs from what the last decades of consumption and energy savings policies have been based on. It claims that instead of information- and awareness-campaigns, it is creating changes in everyday practices that will lead to not only reduction in

carbon emissions, but also to a sustained change in attitudes and norms (Hopkins 2013). Thus the movement works to involve people in local community activities to try to collectively change social practices around energy-related consumption. Examples are growing food locally, encouraging energy conservation and transport- alternatives to cars and exemplifying low-carbon living.

Yet scholars have questioned the ability of such a movement, excluded from positions of economic and political power, to transform complex industrial economies and systems through merely providing examples (North 2011). The influence of individual choice in industrialized societies is clearly limited by a range of systemic factors, including the configuration of cities, transport systems, energy and water supply systems, as well as housing and product designs, to name some (Wilhite et al. 2000). Also, the development of a mass movement for less carbon consumption is challenging in modern societies where citizens not only enjoy consumer lifestyles, but the economy and their everyday lives are so dependent on it (Monbiot 2006). Moreover, many have raised questions of whether 'the local' is the right scale to confront problems of global nature (e.g. Brown and Purcell 2005) . In his discussion concerning the potential of environmental community-groups, including the TM, North (2011) puts it like this:

> A concern is the extent that these individual and community-based practices are merely the latest in a long line of therapeutic participatory processes, symbolic practices that do not challenge and perhaps legitimate the fundamental unsustainability of capitalism by making it *seem* like something is being done (North 2011:1594).

Thus in addition to examining whether the TM groups engage citizens in questions of low-carbon living and climate change in a novel way, we also need to examine whether the groups actually do contribute to the change towards less energy intensive consumption practices as they promise.

1.3 Previous research

Social science research on consumption and energy has until recently been limited in its scope, largely focusing on the behavior of a presumed rational end user, leading to an oversimplification of the nature and causes of demand (Shove et al 1998, Wilhite et al 2000, Princen et al 2002). In both theory and policy, reducing consumption has mainly been approached by promoting individual behavior change on the one hand, and designing more efficient and cleaner production technology and systems on the other - both from an assumption that it is the individual who ultimately is responsible for using more efficient technology alternatives and thus either acts as a barrier or as a catalyst to change (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). Hence, the dominant solution in mainstream policy has been what Maniates calls "the individualization of responsibility" (2001:33): Promoting enlightened, individual consumer action.

Both the individualist paradigm and the structural paradigm have their distinct set of theoretical assumptions and preferred policy strategies (Spaargaren 2013:230). The former tend to ignore how individuals are embedded in larger systems of social norms, material infrastructure and cultural values all influencing choices, and thus its policies for 'behavior change' through information-campaigns and appealing to the moral responsibility of citizen-consumers have largely failed (ibid, Halkier 2013, Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). In the latter paradigm, focusing instead on influencing institutional actors, the underlying assumption of behavior change is one where consumer-citizens will automatically change once the necessary institutions, products and regulations are in place (Spaargaren 2013). However, such a top-down approach is also problematic; firstly because citizen-consumers are not able to participate in, or democratically control, "processes integral to their own lives" (ibid: 232). Secondly, because studies have shown how products and technologies that are created and implemented without reference to user practices fail to realize the planned environmental

benefits (ibid). This impasse in understanding consumption is integral for what this thesis seek to investigate: an alternative taking into account both individual agency and macro-social structure.

Studies of social movements' role in environmental change and politics by now have a long history within the social sciences, primarily focusing on movements' contestation of states and firms (Litfin 2009). The Transition Movement has however only recently come to the attention of academics, primarily in the UK where it started (e.g. Smith 2011, North 2011, Seyfang and Haxeltine 2012, Reeves et al 2013), but also in for example the USA (Hardt 2013), in Belgium (Kenis and Mathijs 2014) and New Zealand (Stephenson et al 2010). These scholars and others have studied why TM groups emerge, their composition and also to a limited degree their potential role in influencing energy systems. There has however been little research on groups in Norway. There is an ongoing project by the research institute Telemark Research Institute[5], which seeks to understand the TM in Norway as a model for local sustainable development. The project is made in cooperation with the same TM groups I study. The two groups have also been subject to study in another master thesis, which compared their organizing model with a different community group from an ecological economic perspective, mainly arguing that all were dependent on enthusiasts driving the groups to keep afloat (Bang-Andersen 2013). As far as I have managed to find out, no one has studied the formation of TM groups in Norway or its potential contribution to changing energy-related consumption practices in a Norwegian context.

The UK-based research project Community Innovation for Sustainable Energy (CISE) has looked into community-based movements and their role in so-called energy transitions, including the UK's Transition initiatives. An

[5] A presentation of the project can be found here: http://www.telemarksforsking.no/publikasjoner/filer/2362.pdf. No articles or findings have been published yet.

inspiration for this thesis is the research agenda sketched out by Seyfang et al. (2010) from CISE, which suggests an interdisciplinary approach for analysing agency and civil society in transition processes in contemporary societies. This agenda presents some benefits from insights into social movement theory and social practice theory for explaining grassroots groups working with energy questions, which I use as a starting point.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

The thesis is organized in seven chapters. Chapter 2 will briefly discuss current energy-, climate- and consumption realities and policies in Norway, in order to give a *contextual background* for understanding the chosen cases. It will also present the Transition Movement and the chosen chases, followed by a short presentation of the practices to be studied. Chapter 3 will outline the *methodological approach* of this study and discuss its limitations and ethical considerations. Chapter 4 will outline the *theoretical framework* used for analysis; a combination of social practice theory and social movement theory. Chapter 5 will provide an *analysis* of empirical data in order to answer the first research question; how and why the TM groups have formed and mobilized participants. Chapter 6 will provide an *analysis* of empirical data in order to answer the second research question; whether, how and why participation in the TM groups has contributed to a change in energy-related practices. It will also draw together the findings for both research questions, before chapter 7 provides a final discussion, some *conclusions* and prospects for further research.

2. Energy-related consumption, the environmental movement and TM in a Norwegian context

In international forums and politics, Norway is a strong advocate for global climate change mitigation (IEA 2011). Yet contrary to several neighbouring countries, Norway's own national greenhouse gas emissions increased—with close to five percent—from 1990–2013 (SSB 2014), despite Norway being a signatory to the Kyoto protocol, where the country obliged to reduce its emissions to no more than one percent growth within the same time frame. Moreover, through the Climate Agreement ('Klimaforliket')[6], the Parliament has committed to curb Norwegian emissions with 30 percent from the 1990 emission level, by the year 2020. Some of these emission cuts will be made through carbon offsetting in other countries, and not solely by emission cuts from Norwegian production and consumption. Nevertheless, a recent governmental report shows that Norway still is far from reaching the set goal (Miljødirektoratet 2014a).

Because of a historical dominance of hydropower and hence a widespread use of electricity, energy use in households and buildings is already low-carbon in Norway compared to many other countries (IEA 2011). The largest source of energy-related emissions in Norway is the relatively large—compared to other Western countries—proportion of energy-demanding industry, particularly oil- and gas production. Reducing Norwegian greenhouse gas emissions will therefore depend on further measures to internalise the costs of emissions from this sector, as well as from the manufacturing and transport sectors (IEA 2011). At the same time, although production activities are responsible for the majority of environmental

[6] 'Klimaforliket' is based on the centre-left coalition government's white paper on Norwegian climate policies (St.meld 21 (2011-2012)) passed in Parliament in June 2012. After the change of government in 2013 the Progress Party (FrP), who was the only party not part of the Klimaforliket when originally signed, have obliged itself to work for "strengthening" the Klimaforliket as part of acceding to power in a coalition government with the Conservative Party. Thus today all major political parties in Norway support the Klimaforliket.

pressures in most economies, "private and public consumption of goods and services is the fundamental casual factor and driver of change" in these activities and their emissions (EEA 2012:6). In addition, in a comprehensive study of the environmental strain of Norwegian production and consumption in the period 1987-2007, Hille et al (2008) show that the greenhouse gas emissions from Norwegian end consumption—here measured in economical and physical units used by private households and the public, and the energy consumption associated—has actually increased somewhat more than the total emissions from Norwegian production[7]. The scholars point to the trend noted by consumption scholars in the former chapter: efficiency gains in production and consumption technologies are outweighed by the total increase in end consumption[8]. Accordingly they argue for the necessity of a more consumption-oriented environmental policy, challenging the *volume* of consumption and not only the *pattern* (2008:196-202).

Yet Hille et al also show that such an environmental policy has been noted in official policy documents to be unfeasible, as to radically change Norwegian consumption levels is seen to be "an impossible political assignment to realize" (NOU 2006:18 in Hille et al 2008:194, my translation). The question of sustainable consumption has nevertheless gained increased attention while focus has increased on the potentially harmful consequences of climate change, and as studies published show that greenhouse gas emissions from equal-income households can vary with as much as three times the amount per person - solely as a result of different ways of consumption (EEA 2012). The need for a change in consumption behavior is noted in a recent governmental report (Miljødirektoratet 2014b:57). However, although the

[7] Although one important exception is found to be over-fertilisation, due to the growth of Norwegian fish farm production. For a complete overview of the measurements and methods employed, see Hille et al (2008).

[8] Important to note is that Hille et al (2008) here include not only direct, but also indirect energy consumption in the measurements: that is both the energy used by a product and the energy use embedded in that product. The authors argue that both are necessary in order to measure total energy-related greenhouse gas emissions from Norwegian consumption.

report states that the "consumption pattern of the population will potentially influence Norway's future emission level" (ibid:2, my translation), and recognizes the importance of "an increased awareness among consumers of the links between greenhouse gas emissions and consumption" (ibid:57, my translation), it simultaneously states that it will not make a comprehensive analysis of the effects on changes in consumption. Its only policy recommendation is to ensure better product labelling to facilitate the choice of more "climate friendly products" (ibid:57, my translation). Thus, as noted in the former chapter, also in Norway policymakers mainly confront consumption issues, if at all, with means like providing better information for assumed-to-be rational individuals, focusing on consumption patterns and not volume.

In Norwegian public debate it has become a common statement from politicians that they need a mandate by the voters to prioritize climate policies stronger, while the environmental organizations are claiming that the problem is rather a lack of political leadership. Ryghaug et al (2011) argue that:

> We seem to be in a paradoxical and problematic situation where politicians are waiting for their constituencies to have a clear opinion, while voters look to politicians to take the lead. Climate science cannot be expected to break this stalemate on its own (2011:793).

Then how can it be broken? Boykoff (2010) argues that no matter what national or international policy mechanisms are chosen, political support and engagement from the public will be required for any political leader to realize them. In democratic societies, both "political pragmatism and normative arguments suggest that the future world is unavoidably dependent on the degree to which the public is engaged on the issue of climate change" (2010:157). Public engagement is here understood as more than a high level of awareness, and includes a cognitive dimension (understanding), an affective dimension (concern) and a behavioral dimension (active response) (ibid).

Public opinion polls can be a useful tool to get a basic overview of where the public stands within these dimensions. According to recent polls, a clear majority of the Norwegian public support the scientific evidence that climate change is real and that it is caused by human activity (TNS Gallup 2013) - an indicator of cognitive engagement with the issue. If we look at indicators for affective engagement, the picture is somewhat mixed. In the polls, nearly half think that the government's climate policies should be more ambitious, and 2/3 think that Norway as a large oil and gas producer has a special responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (ibid) - a sign of concern for the issue. However, when asked which issues are the most important, Norwegians rate climate change lower than issues such as health, education, immigration and transport. This can be a sign of weak concern for the issue. In many countries the concern for climate change has declined the last decades—including Norway—although there has been some increase since 2005 (Hernes 2012:138). At the same time, the political parties advocating stronger mitigation and environmental policies in Norway has had rather weak election results the last years. Hence, behavioral engagement with the issue in the form of political support seems to be rather weak. Behavioral engagement in form of political activism is not measured in the polls. However, the number of Norwegians engaging in Norwegian environmental organizations has declined since its top in the early 1990s (Bortne et al 2002).

Bortne et al (ibid: 124) argue that the reasons for the decline in membership can be multifaceted, but highlights two important factors: the changes in ideological climate and the increase in the differently organized environmental organizations like Bellona, who are not membership-based. Furthermore, the authors also touch upon another potential explanation: the changing character of environmental problems, from concrete and local issues like industrial pollution, to abstract and global issues like climate change. The latter more "invisible" problems can be more difficult to mobilize on the basis

of, they argue (Bortne et al 2008:34), as they are not as connected to people's everyday life. The Norwegian environmental movement has also been criticized for being too academic, narrow and negative (Solheim 2013) and too elitist, moralistic and homogenous (Martiniussen 2013). Today, Norway's two largest environmental organizations, Friends of the Earth Norway (NNV) and Future in our hands (FIVH), have approximately 20.000 members each (NNV 2014, FIVH 2014). For comparison, the Swedish and Danish sister organizations of NNV have 203.000 and 125.000 members respectively (SNF 2014, DN 2014), and the Norwegian Red Cross has 125.000 members (Norges Røde kors 2014).

Put bluntly: Norway is a country where a large majority of the population support the science saying that climate change is real and human-caused, where they show a certain concern for the issue; but where they do little about it. The environmental movement has struggled to mobilize Norwegians on the "new" environmental issues like climate change. There has however been a growth in local environmental organizations and local ad-hoc campaigns, reflecting the increased attention devoted to local environmentalism after the Brundtland-report 'Our common future' from 1987 and the UNs action plan 'Agenda 21'from 1992 (Bortne et al 2002). At first glance, the TM can be viewed in connection with this development. It is however not the first social movement to argue a political vision of a more sustainable, low-carbon, small-scale and localist world – the green political movement has advocated similar visions for years (North 2011:1589). Also, Seyfang and Haxeltine (2012:387) argue that the movement in many ways resemble and revitalize previous community-based activities concerned with questions of the environment, quality of life and social inclusion. It also shows some parallels to a strand of the environmental movement formed in the beginning of the 1970s in Norway, who problematized aspects of economic growth, modernization and technological development, and advocated

alternative lifestyles emphasizing life quality rather than material growth (Bortne et al 2008). Although rather positive towards new technologies and their implementation at local scale, the TM movement is skeptical towards technological optimism at a large-scale (North 2011:1590). Instead, a low carbon economy should be built bottom-up, community by community, through a re-localization of businesses, and co-operatives (Hopkins 2013). However, the alternative orientation within the environmental movement never grew to be strong in Norway (Bortne et al 2002). The question is whether the TM will be different. Can the TM manage to engage Norwegians in the issue of climate change, and actually influence participants to change their consumption practices?

In a study of Norwegian energy efficiency policies Karlstrøm et al (2013) argue that also in Norway policymakers have failed "to understand the socio-material qualities of energy and energy use" (2013:8): National policy instruments have mainly focused on engineering new technologies and promoting cost-efficient solutions. Although the authors mainly study direct energy use, some of their insights into why such policy instruments fail to become relevant for people's everyday lives may also be useful for understanding indirect energy consumption. The authors argue that costs remain a weak motive for engaging Norwegians in energy savings, because they—like many other affluent societies—emphasize comfort as a criterion of well-being (ibid:4). The authors also argue that policies should pay more attention to "the fact that the doing of energy efficiency is about learning how to do it and just doing it" (ibid:8). Here they emphasize that friends and neighbours play a crucial role in providing information of "how to organize everyday life and its material context" (ibid). From this perspective, the TM groups serve as an interesting case. In their engagement with mainstream energy-related consumption practices and innovation of alternatives, the

groups may act as driving forces for and inventors of less energy-intensive practices - for both direct and indirect energy consumption.

2.1 The Transition Movement and the two Norwegian cases

The philosophy and aim of the Transition Movement has already been mentioned, but not its origins or form. The movement started with the establishment of Transition Town Totnes in the UK in late 2005. At the time the model was called Transition *Towns*, but it later started referring to itself as a movement, as also cities, islands and urban neighborhoods adopted it. It takes the form of decentralized local groups, connected through the organisation Transition Network[9], which aims to give support, advice and to connect the different initiatives. As of September 2013 (their latest published toll per November 2014), over 1100 initiatives in over 40 countries was registered at Transition Network, and many more were forming, although there is great variation in how active they are (Transition Network 2013b). Most of the groups are located in the global North, but lately initiatives have started up in the global South. Compared to neighbouring countries, there are few initiatives active in Norway. This study will focus on the two oldest and per date largest: Omstilling Sagene and Bærekraftige Liv på Landås.

'Omstilling Sagene' (hereby referred to as OS) is Norwegian for 'Transition Sagene'—the name refers to the Transition Movement that its model is derived from. The group's objective, as stated in their statutes, is to "contribute to the formation of a sustainable local community" in the urban district of Sagene in Oslo. This objective includes creating "a stronger identity of place, local sense of belonging and a tighter and livelier community in Sagene"; making Sagene "less dependent on non-renewable resources" and "more resilient to climate change and other environmental and societal

[9] For more information about the organization, visit http://www.transitionnetwork.org/

challenges". 'Bærekraftige Liv på Landås' (hereby referred to as BLL) translates into 'Sustainable lives at Landås'. The goal of the group, as stated in the public register, is primarily twofold: to increase life quality and to decrease the ecological footprint, simultaneously, of Landås, a residential area in Bergen. Additionally, contrary to OS, the group explicitly states an aim to spread knowledge, experience and ideas to other neighborhoods.

2.1.1 Location and scale

OS has chosen to adopt the borders of the administrative district Sagene in Oslo for their outreach and activities. The district compounds a population of 35.990 people (2012) in an area of 3, 1 km^2, making it the district in Oslo with the highest population density. Its demographic structure is changing due to population growth and increasing housing prices (Sagene Bydel 2014). A long time the district with the largest share of social housing and the lowest life expectancy among inhabitants in Oslo, Sagene has the last few years experienced a greater influx of highly educated young people and a sharp decrease in inhabitants with disability benefits. The majority of the population is today young adults between 20-39 years of age, while the share of elderly is decreasing (ibid). Sagene is also one of the districts in Oslo with the highest share of well-educated people; the level of education differing greatly between the younger and older parts of the population. Compared to Oslo as a whole, Sagene has a higher share of single people and a lower share of people with children. It is also a district with high mobility; 22% of the population moves out of the district every year. Although the district comprises a vast area, most of OS'activities and meetings take place in a rather small area around Sagene square. At the time this study was conducted, OS consisted of around 30 people who were referred to as 'active', meaning that they were a part of at least one of the working groups and usually took part in group activities. In addition, around 300 people have subscribed to the mailing list of OS and thus have said that they want regular information about the group's activities.

Bærekraftige Liv på Landås (BLL) is located in the residential area called Landås in the city district Årstad in Bergen. Although there is a larger area that often goes by the name Landås, BLL has for their purposes defined Landås as the area responding to postal codes 5096 and 5097 Bergen, which together form a school district and a church district, and includes approximately 6400 inhabitants. Like Sagene in Oslo, also Landås[10] is one of the districts in Bergen with the highest share of well-educated people (Bergen kommune 2011). It is also a district with a relatively low share of social housing and low share of persons with disability pensions, and the median income is neither low nor high compared with other districts in Bergen. The vast majority of the population is between 20-66 years of age, with a rather large proportion in the latter end of that scale compared to other districts of Bergen (ibid). At the time this study was conducted, BLL consisted of around 80 people referred to as 'volunteers', meaning that they were part of one of the working groups and aimed to contribute to the planning of at least one activity every semester in addition to participating at other activities. In addition, around 600 people have subscribed to the mailing list of BLL and thus have said they want regular information about the group's activities. The activities of BLL are scattered throughout the area defined by the group, which much smaller than OS' area.

2.1.2 Organisational structure and history

Omstilling Sagene was formed by three friends in November 2010, who were inspired by the Transition Town movement and its model. Two of them had taken a start-up course provided by the Transition Network in the UK prior to

[10] 'Landås' here corresponds approximately to the area demarcated by BLL. The local administration in Bergen base their statistics on a different geographic classification than postal codes, but in their social statistics report they identify 'Landås' as a category that overlaps, with only a slight difference, the postal codes demarcated by BLL. This difference should of course be taken into account, but for my purpose of merely describing the context of the case the difference is too small to legitimate further research into it.

forming the group. They started out by inviting their own friends and people in the neighborhood to film screenings in the local community house (Sagene Samfunnshus) and gradually expanded their activities as more people joined. In June 2013 they registered as an official not-for-profit organisation in the Norwegian public registers (Brønnøysundregistrene 2013a). The founders were slightly reluctant to do so due to the informal nature of the group, but explain their decision by wanting to be able to seek funding externally. Still, they strongly emphasize the importance of keeping an open and informal atmosphere and as flat a structure as possible[11]. All of the work done within and by Omstilling Sagene is based on volunteering as there are no paid positions. The group has received a small amount of funding from the local government over the last few years, but exclusively this has been used to cover costs of running projects and activities. Today, the three founders, together with three others, form what they call the "Facilitating group". This group is in charge of the administration, the economy and the daily operation and development of the organisation.

BLL was formed by three neighbours and friends in the summer of 2008, all three with a background of working on environment and solidarity issues within the Church of Norway. They started out by inviting their friends in the neighborhood to film screenings and community dinners. In late 2009, the three initiators applied for funding to create a three years pilot project to develop and diffuse what they called their model of local sustainability. The pilot project (2010-2012) received funding from the municipal government Bergen Kommune, the county administration Hordaland Fylkeskommune, the Norwegian network organization Grønn Hverdag (promoting environmentally conscious consumption), and the regional savings bank Sparebanken Vest. The

[11] As an example; establishing a formal board was not done until the group "had to", as a requirement of the public registers. Today the board consists of the three founders and one other person. The chairman of the board is chosen by drawing lots, and does not have more formal power than the others in the board, his/her identity even remaining unknown for most participants (they can easily find out by checking the registers, but it's not something proclaimed by the board or said to be deemed important within the group).

local affiliation of the Church of Norway provided employer's liability. Together, this allowed for part time positions that were divided between the three. Hence, in contrast to OS, BLL did not start out as a TM group. Not until late 2010 did BLL discover the Transition Movement online and decided to become a part of it. One of the three initiators conducted a course by the Transition Network in the UK before they registered officially as part of the network. At the end of the pilot, no new stable funding was in place. One of the initiators found it necessary to leave the project for a stable income, and was soon hired by the climate department of the municipality. The two others continued running BLL as a more or less full-time job unpaid. In October 2013 they registered as an official not-for-profit organization in the Norwegian public registers (Brønnøysundregistrene 2013b) to be able to seek external funding. They established a board of people from the neighborhood with organizational experience, to look at possible future funding structures and solutions.

2.1.3 Relations to external actors

OS strongest partnerships are with the local administration and the local school gardens. OS disposes three of the administrations premises to run activities, and have been given several beds for growing at the school gardens. The group's small budget makes it difficult to rent premises or pay for beds, so their solution has been swap-arrangements. This also suits their ideological underpinnings; through exchanging services instead of entering market-based transactions OS intends to practice the alternative and local economy vision they wish to promote. Thus, OS use the premises and beds for free and in return delivers some kind of service. For the local administration OS is maintaining garden installations at the public square; at the local school gardens OS helps out with general maintenance work. The latter also have an interest in spreading the ownership of the gardens, after several times being

threatened with closure, according to OS initiators. OS also has an agreement to borrow facilities from a private actor with no strings attached, explained by the OS with the actor's personal belief in the movement and his own interest in making Sagene a tighter community. In addition to these partnerships, OS have cooperated with different organizations and actors on specific events and projects. OS has shared some of their experiences with two other TM-initiatives starting up in the nearby region, but has only to a small degree actively tried to spread their model or build relations with other likeminded groups.

In contrast, BLL has set an explicit goal of spreading its model to other neighborhoods. The initiators have met with people interested in starting up similar initiatives; they have shared advices and materials and facilitated connections. The model of BLL has currently spread to eight neighborhoods in Bergen and is according to BLL being contemplated by many more from all over the country[12]. BLL has also started projects in cooperation with larger actors like the governmental institution Transnova (a research project looking at how inhabitants at Landås may reduce their use of personal cars as means of transport), the Norwegian State Housing Bank and Bergen University College (a research project looking at how a typical apartment block at Landås can become more energy efficient) and Carma Bergen (a car sharing collective). The initiators of BLL have also held several meetings with local politicians in Bergen, where they have presented their projects and advocated for more environmentally friendly solutions at Landås. They also have arrangements with several local institutions that lend to them premises cost free, such as the hostel Montana, the local school, the local church and Ulriken community house.

[12] A map produced by the BLL shows where similar initiatives have formed, and where people have shown interest in doing so: https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=zmZyr1fIcY9c.kIQA_WvUhkk8&hl=en-US

2.2 The practices to be studied

This study will examine the potential change that alternative practices can have for the energy use embedded in three specific practices: a) buying imported food in the supermarket; b) driving a car to and from work and spare time activities; c) regularly buying new clothes and throwing old ones away. These practices are chosen for both pragmatic reasons and because of their relevance. First and foremost, these are the main practices that both groups engage in and deem important in a Norwegian context—and thus the most relevant to study. They are also however relevant from an energy-related consumption point of view: Studies from different industrialized countries concur that the majority of the energy use of, and greenhouse gas emissions from, modern household consumption comes from food and transport (as well as housing[13]) (EEA 2012). This is also the case for Norway (Hille et al 2008). Studies also indicate that increased consumption of cheap, imported goods such as clothing is currently contributing to enlarging the energy use and environmental impact of household consumption (Hille et al. 2008).

2.2.1 Food

Concerns over the energy intensity and unsustainability of modern food systems—roughly the production, distribution and consumer choices of foods—has led to a growing trend of localization of food, where 'local' is framed not only as an environmentally and socially sustainable alternative to, but also in some regards the solution to the problems of, global industrial agriculture (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). Especially the question of 'food

[13] As housing (mainly heating) represents a large part of the energy consumption of Norwegian households (Hille et al 2008) it would be fruitful to include it as a cluster of practices in the study. When it is not, it is because the two groups to be studied to a limited degree arrange activities within this domain. BLL do have a project in cooperation with the local university college on creating a guide for how to insulate a typical house in the area in order to save electricity, but it was still under making at the time of this project and the regular participant was not involved in this activity. BLL also arranges an activity of somewhat regularly chopping wood in the local forest for heating purposes which could have been an interesting practice to look at. Yet OS have none activities related to housing, and so a comparison would be impossible.

miles' has reached widespread attention, with advocates of localization pointing particularly to the large greenhouse gas emissions from transport of imported foods (ibid). Still, researchers have shown that the claimed benefits of local foods do not always come to the fore, as it depends on e.g. the operational efficiency and/or conditions of producers and not only on food miles traveled (Kenis and Mathjis 2014). For example, Norwegian vegetables grown with the help of pesticides and greenhouses demanding a lot of energy can be less environmentally friendly than imported vegetables from countries with a warmer climate (Hille 2012). However, for most fruits and vegetables grown *in season* in Norway, the greenhouse gas emissions are very low and much lower than for imported ones (ibid) . Hille (2012) emphasizes fruits and vegetables as the food where Norwegians have an opportunity to reduce transport emissions from their consumption, by growing their own vegetables or by buying produce from farmers nearby (presupposed the latter has not traveled a longer detour to be refined first).

Thus, buying imported foods in supermarkets is a consumption practice in which energy use is embedded in different ways, from processes of production and distribution. I will look at two alternative consumption practices that the TM groups promote, which have the potential to challenge the practice of buying imported foods and reduce the energy use of food consumption. The first alternative is to buy local food instead of imported ones. The second is to grow one's own vegetables instead of buying imported ones.

2.2.2 Transport

The development of industrialized countries in the 20th century is "intimately linked" to the development of automobilisation (Attali and Wilhite 2001:450). Although urban areas of today may have highly developed public transportation systems, for many people it is a great challenge to accomplish the tasks and routines of everyday life without having access to a car,

especially for families with children as schools, workplaces and super markets are often located such that a car is required (ibid). In many cultures, owning a car is also loaded with positive symbolism of freedom, mobility and social status (ibid). Although the fuel efficiency of cars has increased the last decades, the potential reduction in emissions has in European countries been countered by an increase of the number of cars and the number of miles driven (EEA 2012).

The energy consumption of the Norwegian transport sector increased with almost 40 percent from 1990 to 2010, and 90 percent of it is based on fossil fuels (St.meld nr 21 (2011-2012) (2011)). Consequently, the greenhouse gas emissions from the sector increased with 30 percent from 1990-2012 (Miljødirektoratet 2014b). The transport sector equaled 33 percent of Norway's total emissions in 2012 (ibid), the majority of it from transportation by roadway. Transportation of goods is by large the largest polluter, but also emissions from personal cars have increased, with 7 percent since 1990 (ibid). These figures are based on calculations from direct energy consumption only, and counts only the consumption taking place within Norway, and so do not take into account the energy and emissions embedded in the production of the car, of the gasoline, of the transport infrastructure etc.

Driving a car is thus a consumption practice in which energy use is embedded in different ways. The benefits of developing public transportation- and bicycle infrastructure to reduce energy use and emissions have been well-argued (Xia et al 2013). Also car sharing, the practice where a large number of people share access to one or several cars, has been shown to reduce both the number of cars per family and car utilization measured in both trips and kilometers (Attali and Wilhite 2001). We will look at how the TM groups engage and promote these alternative mobility practices: the bicycle as well as what I have termed 'collective transportation'; including both public transportation and car sharing. Both alternative practices have the potential to

challenge the practice of using the car and thus reduce the energy use and emissions of transportation practices.

2.2.3 Clothing

Norwegian household's expenditure on clothes and shoes increased with 147 percent from 1987-2006 (Hille et al 2008). The import of clothes increased with 67 percent over the last 20 years, and equaled 15 kilo per inhabitant in 2013 (Laitala and Klepp 2014). This consumption is problematic from an energy and environmental point of view because of the amounts of embedded energy in the production and transport of clothing. As an increasing share of the clothing Norwegians buy are produced in Asia, the energy sources used in the production are most often based on fossil fuels and the distance for transport is long and energy-intensive (Hille et al 2008).

Laitala and Klepp (2014:25) argue that the sharing and inheritance of clothing between families, friends, but also larger circles of people, can contribute to reducing the environmental impact of consumption of clothing in Norway. Moreover, reuse and exchanging are mentioned as measures that increasingly are being given attention in a growing debate on the sustainability of our clothes consumption (ibid). The authors find that sharing and borrowing of clothes is not unusual in Norway, especially not for children in the form of inheritance. There is still little knowledge of to which extent that this sharing takes place and the motivation behind it.

This study will look at two concrete alternative consumption practices that the TM groups promote, and which have the potential to challenge the practice of buying new clothes. The first alternative is to, instead of buying new or throwing old away, either buy second-hand, exchange or borrow someone else's clothes. The second is to repair or reuse your clothing instead of buying new or throwing old away.

3. Methodological approach

This study can be described as a mixed-methods comparative case study, as I use different methods in the study of two different cases, compare their findings and ultimately draw some cross-case conclusions. The research was conducted in late 2013 and early 2014, and the findings are based on 14 interviews with 16 persons, two online surveys with respectively 206 (BLL) and 103 (OS) respondents (the former conducted in late 2012 by Telemark Research Institute and thus secondary data), and participant observation in both groups over the course of six months, including a number of informal conversations.

The advantage of using several methods is that it allows for collection of a stronger array of evidence than what can be accomplished by solely one method (Yin 2009). This has parallels to the advantages of interdisciplinary research[14], drawing on perspectives from different disciplines in the same study, which holds promises of addressing problems in new and necessary ways, providing new insights (Robinson 1996). The most emphasized challenge of interdisciplinarity, and the one most relevant to my study, is closely related to questions of methods, as the differences between the methodological traditions of disciplines, tightly knit to the differing ontologies and epistemologies, reflects certain assumptions about how the world is and how it can be studied (Moses and Knutsen 2007). This again influences what methods are used and how they are used. Moses and Knutsen (ibid:15) argue that it is possible to succeed at moving between methodological traditions and advocate tailoring ones choice of methods to the problems of interest rather than tailoring these problems to the methods learned. As a student of interdisciplinary background, this is what I have strived to do.

[14] Following Norgaard and Sharachchandra (2005), for sake of brevity I use the term 'interdisciplinarity' to describe all forms for crossings of different disciplines, although acknowledging the differences others have noted between multi-, inter- and transdisciplinarity.

In this chapter I describe the research design as well as the different methods employed and discuss their strengths and weaknesses. Furthermore, I reflect upon the limitations and ethical considerations of the chosen methodology, and the potential consequences such limitations may have for the data I have collected and for its subsequent analysis.

3.1 Choice of case study and research design

Case study as a method for studying social phenomena is according to Yin (2009) preferred when the study in question can be described with the following three criteria: a) questions of "how" and/or "why" are posed; b) the researcher has little control over events; c) when examining contemporary phenomena in a real-life context. This thesis fits all of the above: First of all, it asks questions of *how* the TM groups work, what it leads to and *why*. Second, as the research is conducted in the field—in the participant's homes, at meetings and activities of the groups—I have little control over the events. Lastly, the TM groups are definitely a contemporary phenomenon, acting out in real-life context in their respective communities. The latter point touch upon another particularity of case studies: that it is often difficult to draw the boundaries between the case itself and the context in which the case is embedded (Yin 2009). Although defining the boundaries of a case study is an important part of developing a clear and coherent research design to ensure scientific rigor, to develop a richly detailed and 'thick' description[15] of both the case and its context is a principal objective of the case study (Snow and Trom 2002). In this study I will seek to understand the case within its context. The boundaries of the two cases are set to include the participants of the two respective groups and their activities, whereas their external partners or non-

[15] In his influential essay "Thick description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" (1973), Geertz argue that to understand human action one must not only look simply at observable behavior, but also interpret it in light of the social and cultural norms and structures giving the action its *meaning*.

participants in the neighborhood are excluded[16]. This is done because my research questions emphasize the group dynamic and its effect on practices of individuals and norms within the group and, due to the study's limited scope, I was less interested in the effect the group may have on a larger area. The latter nonetheless serve as the context of the cases and hence it was also important to collect secondary data about the larger areas in which the groups are active.

To generate the data necessary to achieve a rich understanding of the case a triangulation of methods—including but not limited to qualitative techniques—is imperative (Yin 2009). The flexibility inherent in its design and execution is one of the case study's strengths; namely its ability to deal with a range of evidence and sources of data to get as full a picture of the case as possible (ibid). Thus a case study is not only *a* method, but can in itself take form as a mixed methods study or strategy, where different research methods are embedded in the case study as the researcher combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques (Snow and Trom 2002)—in this thesis, I will form the case study as such.

Yin (2009) argues that a multiple-case study, even if only two cases, is almost always to prefer over single-case studies because it has the opportunity to gather more compelling evidence and consequently more robust findings. By studying two cases I am able to compare and contrast findings between the two. A challenge, however, is that two cases demand more resources and time, potentially compromising an in-depth understanding of the different cases—especially given the short time-frame and restricted financial resources typical of master theses. Still, I assess the benefits of being able to include a comparison of two different Transition groups as more important than the disadvantage of reduced ability to go in-depth, particularly as I am interested

[16] Yin (2009:30) argues that several case studies have been mistaken for being studies of neighborhoods when in fact they were studies of small groups in these neighborhoods. To be clear: this thesis studies the two cases of BLL and OS, not their corresponding areas Landås or Sagene, which rather serve as the context of the cases.

in the mechanisms explaining the groups' formation and/or contribution to changing practices. Looking at potential differences in the groups' results may help explain which mechanisms or factors are more important than others in creating those results, and how different context might affect these. The rationale for choosing BLL and OS as the two cases for this study was twofold: Firstly, they are part of the same movement, but take place in contrasting contexts; OS in the middle of the capital city Oslo, BLL in a residential area outside the city centre of Bergen. Secondly, they are the two oldest and biggest Transition initiatives in Norway and were chosen over the other, smaller TM groups (all more or less in their starting phases) because of their experience and longer period of activity, which is important in a study where we want to see the potential effects of such activities.

3.2 Online survey

The prime objective for including a survey in this thesis was to get a description of the participants; primarily their socio-demographic background, but also to get a better understanding of their motives and actions than my few and more resource-demanding interviews would be able to give. The findings are used primarily to triangulate evidence from qualitative methods, which I mainly use this thesis. The statistical analysis is thus limited in its scope, and mainly concerns frequency distributions to show the distribution of variables across categories and simple means of examining relationships between variables such as cross-tabulation (Overton and Diermen 2003:45-46). Klandermans and Smith (2002:6) argue that survey designs which do not only serve description purposes—but also draw comparisons across movements, space or time—provide a stronger empirical leverage. The survey used in this thesis do so to some degree, as it asks the same questions to two groups of the same movement in different locations, and thus can be used to draw comparison across space. Comparing the TM to another movement would not

be relevant for my thesis and comparison over time was difficult due to the short time frame. However, comparisons across space can give insights into contextual variation, which was important for this study. Klandermans and Smith note two key methodological challenges that must be addressed in order to compare successfully: both the sampling frames for the different populations and the questions asked must be comparable (2002:9).

The development and implementation of the survey was done in cooperation with two researchers at the research institute Telemark Telemark Research Institute (TRI). They had already run a similar survey with BLL and had wanted to do the same with OS. Running a survey is time-consuming and so to spare the participants of their already constrained volunteer time, we found it better to cooperate. Since TF had already run a survey with BLL, I was given access to the results (Haukeland and Bradtzæg 2012). In return, I adopted the survey used at BLL to use with OS as I at this time had gotten to know the group relatively well and had been given access to run a survey with them. For reasons of securing a basis of comparison between the survey results of the two groups, I did not want to substantially change or delete any of the questions. This means that not all of the questions are relevant for this thesis and thus will not be used. I added three questions relevant for my thesis to the survey (see appendix VI for an explanation of which ones and why, and for the survey questions). I asked the initiators and some of the most active participants in OS to look over the questions, to check whether something was missing or misunderstood. This was of help, as they reminded me to include some of their activities that were not included in the question concerning activities. The survey was then adapted to an online survey tool by TRI. I used the software tool SPSS to analyze the results.

Sampling was done by sending out an e-mail with the survey to OS' mailing lists, similarly to how TRI had done their sample within BLL. Because the TM groups by nature are open and informal they have no formal member

register, and the mailing lists are the only available data source that gives a credible measure of the population I seek to investigate - that is the people participating in activities with the OS or BLL. However, to sample respondents by sending out an e-mail to all people on the list obviously may influence the sample, e.g. only the most active and/or eager participants will spend of their time to reply. It can thus increase so-called nonresponse bias; differences between survey respondents and non-respondents that are not random, reducing the reliability and validity of the survey (Klandermans and Smith 2002). However, resource constraints made it difficult to do a smaller sample (implying either doing a background check on all the addresses on the mailing lists, or actively recruit as many respondents in another form) and the sample would also then potentially loose its basis of comparison with the BLL sample. What we did do to increase the number and thus hopefully the diversity of respondents was to give a longer time-frame for replying, and send out two reminder e-mails within that time frame. For BLL, 22 percent of the respondents had completed the survey, whereas 5 additional percent had completed parts of it. For OS, 32 percent of the respondents completed. The response rates are thus acceptable, seeing as mailed questionnaires seldom generate response rates higher than 30 percent for individual surveys (Klandermans and Smith 2002). Still, because of the sampling strategy it is likely that the findings cannot be not fully generalized to the whole population of the groups' participants, a challenge I will discuss further in section 3.5.

There are other important limitations to survey research. The challenges of costs and logistics are already touched upon, but maybe more importantly for this thesis are the limitations in what kind of information a survey can give. Surveys are dependent on what informants want and are prepared to tell us as the distance inherit in its form give us no way of observing their reactions or asking follow-up questions. Moreover, the measures used are generally abstract and superficial, making it difficult to gather data on people's feelings,

uncertainties, rationalities; in short "all the inconsistencies and the complexities of social interactions and belief systems" (Klandermans and Smith 2002:27). As the latter questions are important for this study, it was clear that the survey should be supplemented by qualitative techniques more appropriate for gathering these data.

3.3 Qualitative interviews

Blee and Taylor (2002:92) argue that semi-structured interviewing is "particularly useful for understanding social movement mobilization from the perspective of movement actors", because it provides more breadth and depth compared to more structured interviews or surveys and because it gives access to people's ideas, thoughts and understandings in their own words. The authors highlight the ability of the semi-structured interview to study *meaning*, how people make sense of their own actions and their surrounding world, and its potential for understanding construction of *individual and collective identities*. Both questions are interesting for this thesis.

This potential of semi-structured interviewing to provide a more in-depth understanding comes from enabling a structured conversation that nevertheless opens up for improvisation; for the interviewees to digress, probe and highlight issues important to them although not part of the questions, and for researchers to follow up on interesting details revealed in these interactions. The data collected is thus to a large degree the result of interplay between the interviewer and the interviewees (Kvale 2001:75). Its benefits also represent its challenges; it is time-consuming to do many such interviews, restricting the number available for a study such as mine, and the evidence produced has thus also been criticized for providing small basis for generalizing the results (see section 3.5).

I conducted 14 semi-structured interviews with a total of 16 people; seven interviews within each group, interviewing nine people within BLL and

seven people within OS. Thus in two of the interviews with BLL-participants I interviewed two persons together. One was because the husband of the participant I was interviewing was at home, and seeing as he also is a participant in the movement it fell naturally to ask him some of the questions as well. As I interviewed her for a substantial time before he entered and sat down with us, I could notice that she did not change her argumentation in his presence. The other interview was with two of the initiators of BLL. I found it useful to interview them together as I did not want to take too much of their already constrained time[17], and I had observed them enough in meetings to believe that both were very outspoken and not afraid to say their own opinion in each other's company. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. The interview guide can be found in appendix III. I treated the initiators of the two groups more or less like any other participant in the interview, except that I modified the questions of motivation to address the process of starting up the group, instead of the process of joining the group. The reason they are treated as average participants, and not in a different or more formal capacity, is because they to a large degree are participants as any other due to the informal nature of the groups' activities. Still, their capacity as initiators is relevant for the interpretation of what they say and do, and so their position is emphasized in the chapters of analysis.

Interviewees were chosen deliberately because of their involvement in different activities within the same group. They were thus selected because of their particular experiences with the different practices to be studied, reflecting the underlying questions and theories guiding the research rather than for concern of representativeness (Blee and Taylor 2002:100). Within OS, I had gotten to know the group of active participants enough to understand who were active in what and made the selection based on this. Within BLL, I made

[17] My worry for using too much of the volunteers' time and my dealing with it is explained in section 3.6

a selection partly on the basis of one of the meetings I attended, and partly with the help of one of the initiators who guided me further. Both sampling strategies, although common in qualitative research, are potential sources of bias. With the former, purposeful sampling (Overton and Diermen 2003), the representativeness of the sample largely depends on the judgment of the researcher which evidently will be subjective. With the latter, a form of snowball sampling (ibid), the initiator may have an interest in guiding me to participants who are overly positive towards the group and thereby not representative for the whole group.

Another risk for the representativeness of the sample is the gender balance. In both groups, a majority of the interviewees are female. This partly reflects the fact that a majority of the participants in both groups are female, but also to some degree that more women than men gave their consent to be interviewed. The sampling is most skewed in OS, where only one of the interviewees is male. Here I did get the opportunity to interview two more male informants, which would have increased the representativeness of the sample somewhat, but time and resources did not allow. To address the gender imbalance, I particularly approached men for informal conversations during participant observation. However, all this factors imply that my interview sample is likely not fully representative for the groups in total. Challenges this might hold for the analysis will be addressed in section 3.5.

3.4 Participant observation

In participant observation, the researcher observes and to some degree participates in the action being studied, providing direct evidence on action as it is happening. It offers the researcher a continuum of possibilities ranging from being a complete outsider to being a complete insider (Cresswell 1998). Participant observation thus demands time and is often used as the primary method in ethnography, which emphasizes detailed, observational evidence. A

case study does not attempt to describe an entire cultural system in the way ethnography does (Cresswell 1998), and it is also an inquiry which does not solely depend on participant observer data, but uses it in combination with other data (Yin 2009). So does this study.

Lichterman (2002:120) argues that the method of participant observation is particularly useful for uncovering everyday meanings in social movements, through illuminating "the meanings embedded in everyday life, on motives and emotions" (ibid:121). I participated in a range of meetings and activities within the two groups (appendix V is a list of activities participated in). During these, I wrote down observations, reflections and informal conversations with participants in my field notes (appendix II is a list of the informal conversations that I refer to in the text). A consequence of my formerly mentioned restricted resources led to an imbalance in the time devoted to each case study: Although the number of formal interviews within the two cases is the same, the amount of activities and meetings I participated in and observed at Omstilling Sagene clearly surpass the amount of time I spent in activities with Bærekraftige Liv på Landås. This is mainly due to the fact that OS is located in the city where I myself live and work, and thus their activities are far less demanding to participate in at a regular basis. I could have chosen to restrict my participation in OS to balance my involvement in the two groups, but I found it fruitful for the research to get closer to the group to increase my understanding of its dynamics, inter-relationships and workings. Although this increased my understanding of OS and to some degree the Transition Movement as a whole, it may be problematic for my ability to draw cross-case conclusions, as I have a greater understanding of one of the two cases. I have strived to counteract this imbalance by focusing the cross-case analysis on aspects where I have triangulating evidence from both cases and by cross-checking factors where I have not.

To balance between being a participant in, and an observer and reporter of the world one studies, is fundamental for collecting rich data, but it is also problematic, and a source of challenging ethical considerations for a researcher (Blee and Taylor 2002). The discussion surrounding the relationship between the researcher and the researched is a long and heated one in social science. Lichterman (2002) argue that sympathizing with the social movement you are studying is not necessarily a problem for the scientific rigor of the study, as long as you make your role and independence as a researcher clear for yourself and the other participants. The potential ethical problems of getting too close to the object of study will be further discussed in section 3.6.

3.5 Analyzing case studies and their limitations

In any empirical social research there are a number of analytical biases that can weaken our findings. Four tests or criteria for judging the quality of the research are commonly used within all social science methods to avoid bias influencing the analysis (Yin 2009). The first is a test of the construct validity of the research design; that the researcher identifies the correct operational measures for the concepts being studied. As I will explain further in chapter 4, I operationalize the concept of *change in practices* in this study through examining the distribution and uptake of two alternative practices for each of three different current practices in the two respective groups. Due to this study's limited scope, there are group activities concerning other energy-related practices that will not be discussed, and the study therefore does not preclude that changes can also have taken place concerning other practices with which the groups are interacting. Similarly, the study looks solely at two alternative practices within each of the three current practices, thus other potential alternative practices are neither part of this discussion.

I operationalize the concept of *formation of the groups* by examining demographic and personal characteristics of those who have joined, how they

joined and their motivation for joining. I operationalize *mobilization* by examining mobilization strategies. I do not study non-participants. Klandermans and Smith argue that to understand dynamics of participation, "one needs to compare participants with nonparticipants" (2002:5). To address this problem, I have gathered secondary data of demography and election results for the two respective areas within which the groups have formed, to gain a certain standard of comparison as to *who* has joined. When examining *why* they have joined and personal characteristics of participants other than mere demographic ones, Klandermans and Smith argue that non-participants is not necessarily an appropriate comparison as attitudinal differences between those who participates and those who don't "might result from rather than constitute an underlying motivation for activism" (ibid). They argue that without measurements that both precede and follow participation it is hard to find out whether participants have changed beliefs through taking part in the movement or whether they joined the movement because they shared its beliefs. Arguably the same is the case for studying change in practices; lack of measurements from before participants joined the group can be problematic. For both issues, my solution has been primarily to ask participants of their subjective opinion: whether they have changed their practices or not; whether they have changed their way of thinking about consumption practices or not. A potential bias of such an approach is that it can be hard to remember and pinpoint details of earlier practices and beliefs. This resonates with what Blee and Taylor (2002:105) note as problematic when interviewing people about their motivations: articulating motives for joining a social movement often happens "after the act", and thus there is need to take caution of taking the motives at face value. Another measure I took to address the influence of time was to include a question of how long the participants had participated in the group in both the interviews and the survey for the OS participants, to use this as a qualifier when looking at what they say about changes in practices or their

motivation. This question was however not part of the BLL survey formulated by TRI, making a full comparison between the two groups difficult. A final way to reduce bias and to increase construct validity in case studies is by triangulation - when different measures support the same finding (Yin 2009). Triangulation can be done by different measures (Miles et al 2014); most relevant for my thesis is triangulation by method and by theory (for the latter, see next chapter). As shown, this thesis employs a mix of methods in its empirical inquiry of the two cases, also when it comes to measuring motivation and potential change in practices.

Another test of quality, linked to the concerns raised above, is assessing the *internal validity* of the case study and its methods. This is a concern for studies examining causal relationships. How do I know that changes in practices cannot be explained by some other factor than participation in TM? This also touches upon the broader problem of making inferences from earlier occurrences not observed by the investigator, but made on the basis of interview and survey evidence, as I am doing for this study. I have strived to counteract this potential bias by also addressing rival explanations: Can there be other reasons for the uptake of practices than participation in the groups? These questions will be discussed in the analysis.

Thirdly, the *external validity* of the study must be assessed; whether a study's findings are generalizable beyond the cases studied. Qualitative research methods - such as participant observation, semi-structured interviews and case studies - have all been criticized for providing little basis for generalization of results because of their to varying degrees lack of representative samples. I have already touched upon potential bias in my sampling of survey respondents and interviewees that is important to have in mind when analyzing my findings. Still, Yin argues that a key difference between generalization from quantitative and qualitative research findings is that case studies are "generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to

populations or universes" (2009:15), what he calls 'analytical generalization' instead of 'statistical generalization'. Findings from qualitative methods may serve poorly if the goal is to infer a finding to a population based on a sample from that population. But this is not the case for most qualitative research, neither for this study. Instead, cases are chosen to empirically test theoretical assumptions, to generate insights about the objects under study and/or to expand or generalize some broader theory. Snow and Trom (2002) distinguish between the different forms of theoretical generalization a case study can develop. The aim of this study is theoretical *extension*; a process of extending "existing theoretical formulations to new or different social categories, contexts or processes" (2002:164). By combining insights from social movement theory with those of social practice theory, I hope to extend theoretical formulations of how practices spread or can be made to spread. This can be seen in relation to Kvale (2001:163), who refers to Schoefield's different objectives of generalization in qualitative research. Relevant for this thesis, is his difference between studying *what is* and *what could be*. In the former, the goal of generalizing is to find out the typical; in my case it would be to study what the general contribution of TM initiatives in Norway is today. In the latter, cases are chosen not because they are representative, but because they are examples of cases that are ideal. In my case, BLL and OS are chosen because they are the most established TM groups in Norway. Likewise, my samples of respondents and interviewees probably represent the more active and willing participants. This is done from an assumption that the most advanced cases might give findings that are generalizable for TM groups' potential future role in a Norwegian context (ibid).

Lastly, a test of *reliability* is meant to ensure the replicability and credibility of the study and its findings. I have documented above how data collection has proceeded and I will throughout the study be open about the analytical process. I will in the analysis chapters refer to which interview

provided what information by using the symbol # plus the number of the informant. To see which informant the number relates to, see the full list of informants in the appendix. Here you will also find the results from the surveys. The people interviewed are in the text referred to as 'informants', whereas survey participants are referred to as 'respondents'. For readability, the exact number of informants and respondents behind a finding is rewritten as 'all', 'a majority', 'many', 'some', 'few' and 'none'. Where quotes are used as an example to describe findings they are to different degrees examples of other answers of similar content, unless it is explicitly stated that the quote represents a singular view among the informants.

The concerns raised above about different aspects of my data collection is important to keep in mind, but I have also presented my reflections on what can be done to avoid errors and bias when conducting the analysis and drawing conclusions.

3.6 Ethical considerations

Kvale (2001:66-71) lists a number of ethical research challenges important to consider both before, during and after data collection. The main questions concern the consequences of the study - both in general and for the participants specifically; securing informed consent and the confidentiality of participants; challenges with the researcher's role. I will shortly discuss how I met these challenges.

The first question to be considered is of the potential *consequence*s of the study. One aspect of this is to ask what the beneficial consequences of the study as a whole will be. Kvale argues that the aim of the study should not solely be regarded in relation to the scientific value of the knowledge produced, but also in relation to improving the human condition being studied (2001:67). Likewise, the aim of this study is dual; it is both to inform theory on the role of social movements in general, and Transition groups specifically,

when it comes to reducing energy-related consumption and mobilizing participants, *and* to assist the groups studied in understanding better what of their work is producing the desired results and not, and what they can do about the latter.

One should also ask what potential harm or benefits the participants risk by taking part in the study. I got access to the groups by contacting the initiators of both groups, presenting my research project and asking whether I could join some of the activities and talk to some of the participants. I quickly realized that several researchers had contacted both groups with similar questions already, and that the initiators were finding it difficult to balance their sincere willingness to contribute with the time it demanded, as they were already doing most of this work in their spare time. They probably felt that they had too much on their plate already without dealing with another researcher. It made me think more thoroughly about both my role as a researcher and the aim of the study; it became even more important for me that the study should be of practical value to the groups studied. As a consequence, before I embarked, I discussed the purpose of the study with the initiators to make sure that it had some relevance for their groups. Further, I made it clear that I wanted the study to be beneficial for the groups and that I didn't want to take too much of their time. For OS, which was the group that I participated most actively in, I also decided to contribute to the work load in arranging activities when I was a part of them. This was both to contribute something back and a way to learn more about the workings of the group. I did not however take on any formal responsibility in form of duties of the board that could question my independence as a researcher.

The researcher has a scientific responsibility to ensure that the study produces verifiable knowledge of value (Kvale 2001), thus the independence of the researcher is imperative. This independence can however be weakened both from above, in form of e.g. economic ties from sponsors or by an initial

optimistic attitude towards the project, and from below, in form of over-identifying with the objects of study and taking for granted the local versions or so-called truths (ibid, Miles et al 2014). I do not have any formal ties with the groups - or any other relevant environmental group or social movement - that would influence my research. I am however aware of the potential bias of my wish for the study to be beneficial for the group, but I will argue that beneficial does not necessarily mean that it has to portray the groups positively, it can also point to challenges and potential solutions, which I made clear to the initiators. I am also aware of the potential bias in my considerable engagement in the groups, especially OS, and thus the risk of losing the critical perspective because of over-identification. Still, I will argue with the lines of Lictherman:

> It is entirely possible for you to do what activists in the group under studying are doing, and believe sincerely in the cause, without implying that you are therefore no different from any other member (Lictherman 2002:126).

As discussed under section 3.4, the clue is to on the one hand make sure that the participants are aware that you are a researcher and thus create a certain mental and social distance, which can offer a space for reflection both for yourself and the group participants (ibid). On the other hand, I have also countered the potential bias of getting involved by being aware of it and reflecting upon it during all stages of the research process, and thereby hinder its influence on the analysis.

Informed consent is another fundamental ethical norm of research involving people, meant to avoid improper influence or force (Kvale 2001). Prior to each interview, I explained the objectives and process of the research project, what their participation in it would entail and what would happen to the data collected. I gained consent from all the interviewees that they voluntarily participated in the study and that I could use the data gathered for my thesis (appendix IV). For the survey, the same procedure was followed

(ensured by Telemark Research Institute, who distributed the survey). When it comes to participant observation in the two groups, I made clear to participants that I was researching the groups.

Lastly, the researcher also has a responsibility to ensure the *confidentiality* of the participants. All raw data—survey data, audio recordings, interview transcriptions and field notes—were securely kept on my personal computer and remote online hard drive during the research process and will be deleted at its end. The data set of the OS survey has only been accessible for the two researchers at Telemark Research Institute and me. I gained consent from both BLL and TF that I could use the results of the BLL survey in my project. The interviews were all conducted and transcribed by myself only. The project was registered, assessed and approved by Norway's Data Protection Official for Research (NSD) and thus both fulfil official guidelines for treatment of personal data and is in accordance with relevant bodies of law. The survey data is treated and presented in the report in a way that prevents information being traceable to respondents. Likewise, I chose to anonymize the names of the interviewees in the report. This was done to ensure that the interviewees would speak freely, especially as I was asking questions of somewhat controversial character such as challenges of the group and their opinions of how the groups are organized and of other environmental groups. The interviewees may still be indirectly identifiable by persons knowing the respective groups well, as descriptive characteristics such as sex, age and their degree of participation or role in the groups are included where relevant for the analysis. The interviewees were all informed of this notion prior to the interview and they all gave me their consent. This allowed me to include relevant context in the analysis of their answers and actions and such enhance the discussion.

4. Theoretical frameworks

Interdisciplinary approaches are likely to enhance understandings of the relationship between environment and society (McNeill 1999), including in questions of energy demand, behaviors and change (Stephenson et al 2010, Westskog et al 2011). This thesis is by a student of interdisciplinary background. The following chapter provides insights from two different theoretical traditions to guide the empirical discussion and analysis: social movement theory (SMT) and social practice theory (SPT). Both theories share a concern with systemic, social change, but they differ in their understanding of how processes of social change happen (or fail to happen) (Smith 2012, Hargreaves et al 2013). I will argue that the theories can complement each other in a study of the Transition Movement.

Firstly, I will draw on insights from social practice theory (4.1) in order to understand the formation and diffusion of everyday consumption practices: how the TM works with changing practices in order to reduce energy-related consumption and by doing so also seeks to form new social norms. I will briefly present the theory and its underlying premises and axioms, before I discuss some aspects of the theory that are relevant for answering the research questions posed. Seconfly, I will draw on social movement theory (4.2) in order to understand the formation and mobilization of the TM groups: how the groups form and why they succeed, or not succeed, in mobilizing people. I will start by presenting the theory and TM's place within it, before I look closer at specific aspects of the theory more relevant for answering the research questions. At last I will draw on some overlapping aspects between strands of the two theories (4.3), before I summarize the contributions from each theory and how they can complement each other in a study of the TM (4.4).

4.1 Social practice theory

Social practice theory (SPT) has been developed and influenced by a range of scholars, among others Bourdieu (1977), Giddens (1984), Reckwitz (2002) and Shove et al (2012). Common for their contributions, which we will return to shortly, is an effort to overcome the dichotomy between agency and structure in understanding social change. For this very reason, social practice theory is increasingly applied in analyzing and theorizing consumption and sustainability, including in realms of energy-related consumption (e.g. Westskog et al 2011, Shove et al 2012, Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). As opposed to the purpose-oriented ('homo economicus') and the norm-oriented ('homo sociologicus') models of understanding and explaining action, for long dominating in social theory, practice theory places the social in 'practices' (Reckwitz 2002:249). As Hargreaves put it: "It is the practice itself, rather than the individuals who perform them or the social structures that surround them, that becomes the core unit of analysis" (Hargreaves 2011:82).

4.1.1 Defining practices

Practice theorists understand social life as a series of constantly repeated practices. There are several competing notions of exactly how to define a practice. Synthesizing others and their own work within social practice theory, Shove et al (2012:14) argue that a practice roughly consists of three interdependent elements: *materials* (things, technologies, infrastructure, the body itself), *competences* (understanding, knowledge, skill, know-how) and *meanings* (symbols, emotions, ideas, aspirations). Similarly, Sahakian and Wilhite (2014:28) outline three pillars of practices which resemble the elements synthesized by Shove et al: *the body* (cognitive processes and physical dispositions), *the material world* (infrastructure and technology) and *the social world* (norms, values and institutions). Although drawing the lines between the elements somewhat differently, the two definitions both describe

practices as forming from interaction between the individual's cognitive and embodied knowledge, the things or infrastructure he/she uses and the social norms and meanings attached. To simplify, we can say that practices are carried out by knowledgeable individuals interacting with the material environment, mediated through a socio-cultural context of norms and meanings. By 'knowledgeable' I refer to individuals' use of specific sets of rules and resources that are constitutive of those practices (Spaargaren 2013). As an example, we can look at the practice of showering. It consists of the shower itself and the water infrastructure; the cognitive and practical knowledge of the person taking the shower; the rules and norms defining showering and cleanliness, and it's meaning to practitioners and outsiders. Shove et al (2012:8) distinguish between 'practice-as-entity', which is the conjunction of the above-mentioned elements, and 'practice-as-performance', which is the performance of the practice-as-entity, reproducing and strengthening the interdependencies of its constituting elements. Practices exist in both forms and mutually constitute each other. I will return later to why this can be a useful distinction.

Understanding practices as an interaction between the individual's competences, the material and the social implies that the individual is not the only change agent in consumption patterns; neither are the structures surrounding her. In the context of energy-related consumption, SPT thus directs the policy focus away from either constructing more efficient production systems or convincing assumed-to-be rational consumers of reducing their use; instead it looks towards "the ways in which energy consumption is implicated in the normal and routinized practices that make up everyday life" (Seyfang et al 2010:9). Consequently, from a practice theory perspective, bringing about pro-environmental patterns of consumption depends on "transforming practices to make them more sustainable" (Hargreaves 2011:83).

Transforming practices in a more sustainable direction is exactly what the TM attempts. Its set challenge is to substantially reduce the energy use and ecological footprint within communities through innovating low carbon practices. Spaargaren (2013) argues that this can be done on the one hand by introducing more low-carbon technologies or objects (the material) into the practices, and on the other hand integrating into the practices new norms and ideas promoting sustainability (the social). According to our understanding of practice theory noted above, we should add that it can also be done by exposing individuals to learning (competences).

4.1.2 Habitus and habits

To better understand what lies in 'competences', we will look to the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. His concept of 'habitus' has heavily influenced current syntheses of practice theories. Habitus is a somewhat ambiguous concept, never clearly defined by Bourdieu and formulated in a variety of ways by other scholars (Crossley 2013). Common in most understandings is that habitus denotes people's structured predispositions for acting and understanding (Shove et al 2012, Halkier 2013, Sahakian and Wilhite 2014). These predispositions are embodied and tacit in the sense that they are learned through experiences over time, and become embedded through "practice, action, interaction, activity, experience and performance" (Bourdieu 1998:3). Roughly put, Bourdieu conceptualizes habitus at two different levels of social life: On an individual level, Bourdieu explain human action by arguing that experiences are absorbed into habitus and then turn into dispositions for new actions or understandings. We thus act pretty consistent, in a way that is adapted to the social life and situations we are a part of. Consequently, on a societal level, Bourdieu argues that individuals are part of larger sets of class specific habitus, stemming from differing positions in what he calls social space. According to Bourdieu, particularly in affluent societies

agents and groups are distributed in social space according to their position based on "two principles of differentiation" (1998:6): cultural capital and economic capital. Habitus adapts to the different forms of capital and amounts of it, resulting in different habitus and thus different dispositions for acting and understanding. From this view, the middle class will be predisposed to act differently than working class or upper class.

This conception of habitus as something that can be collectively shared has met criticism; his critics arguing that such class homogeneity is highly exaggerated (Warde and Southerthon 2012). The majority of social scientists do however concur that social position—indicated by socio-economic and socio-demographic characteristics like gender, ethnicity, education and class—systematically influence patterns of behavior. Several scholars researching consumption have found social position and sense of self to be reflected in consumption patterns and therefore also to limit the autonomy of the individual (ibid:11). Bourdieu has also then been criticized for downplaying agency and the subjective meaningfulness of action (Wilhite 2014), but habitus is from a SPT perspective not alone decisive for action. Many practice theory scholars draw on Anthony Giddens' structuration theory (1984) for explaining how know-how and purposes – more commonly noted as 'agency' – is inherit in the action. Giddens understanding of social life has strong resemblances to Bourdieu's habitus: Structuration theory outlines how human activity and surrounding social structures mutually constitute each other. People's actions are shaped by social structures of rules and meanings, but these structures are also shaped by their *reproduction* through human action. Both human agency and social structures thus work as resources and conditions for acting, and this "flow of activities" (Giddens 1984:5) is thus neither a result of solely the conscious purpose of actors or the given social structures. Rather, Giddens emphasizes the role of practices for shaping everyday conduct:

> the basic domain of study of the social sciences, according to the theory of structuration, is neither the experience of the individual actor, nor the existence of any form of social totality, but social practices ordered across space and time (ibid: 2).

In a practice theory perspective, agency is thus not simply located in the individual, but rather distributed between her, the things or technologies she uses and the habits developed in that interaction (Wilhite 2014). Likewise, the concept of habitus denotes "structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures" (Bourdieu 1990:53). Habitus thus structures practices, but can also be structured by those very practices, in what Bourdieu understands as a dynamic relationship (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014).

Habitus is however often confounded with 'habit' in literature (Crossley 2013). Bourdieu argues that the distinction between the two is an important one, as he understands habitus as not a habit, but the dispositions that generate the mechanisms leading to habitual personal or group behavior (Warde and Southerthon 2012). Is habit then the same as practice? Shove (2012) defines habits as practices that are "recurrently and consistently reproduced by suitably committed practioners" (2012:103). All habits are therefore practices, but not all practices are habitual, in the sense that they are routinely and consistently reproduced. The key lies in the timing and frequency of the performance of the activity, argues Shove. Here she uses the distinction noted earlier between practice-as-entity and practice-as-performance:

> While performance of a practice can become habitual for certain practioners, this does not mean that the practice-as-entity is, of necessity, a habit in the sense that proper performance demands and depends on regular re-enactment (2012:104).

Still, many of the most energy-intensive and environmentally significant forms of household consumption are of the habitual kind, like patterns of heating, cooking, showering and transporting (ibid). Habits are thus from a policy perspective often seen as barriers to change, as they are resistant to policy measures of price and persuasion because they lie outside the field of rational choice (ibid:101).

4.1.3 Changing practices and habits

The key question then, when applying practice theory to a study of the TM's potential influence on energy-related consumption, is to understand how practices or habits change and can be made to change. Shove et al (2012) develops an ambitious systematical exploration of the processes of change and stability within and between social practices. They argue that practices emerge, change and dissolve as links between their defining elements are made and broken (2012:21). In this view, a practice must be constantly repeated for the links between its elements to be renewed and reproduced, keeping the practice from changing or dissolving. Sahakian and Wilhite (2014:28) argue that some practices or habits are more resistant to change than others, depending on how deeply anchored they are in relation to the constituting 'pillars', or elements, of practices. Furthermore, Sahakian and Wilhite argue that a change in any one of the pillars may lead to a change in practice or habit, and that a change in more than one can lead to the dissolution of the practice or habit (ibid). They also argue that "addressing only one pillar may not suffice, for example introducing a new technology or influencing cognitive processes through awareness-building programs" (ibid:28). In a cross-cultural study of domestic energy use in Norway and Japan, Wilhite et al (2001) argue that some energy-related habits or practices are more deeply rooted in culture than others and thus resistant to rapid change, whereas other energy-related practices are more elastic (2001:160). Any potential success the TM groups may have in changing practices must thus be seen in light of how deeply anchored the practices they seek to change are, and whether they address more than one of the elements the practice is made of. Relevant for this study is also the potential to change or form norms, which in practice theory are understood as a constituting element of a practice. Social norms are from a SPT perspective reinforced by everyday practices and their conspicuous performance (Shove and Walker 2010). A change of practice, by a change in any of the other elements

constituting it, may therefore also lead to a change in norms. By implication, a change in norms may lead to a change in practices.

Important to note in this regard, however, is that change in one practice can lead to change in other practices, as practices are interrelated. A reduction in one area of consumption might end up increasing total consumption, often called 'the rebound effect' (Sahakian and Wilhite 2014:37). Examining rebound effects will be difficult in a time- and resource limited study such as mine, but the important lesson to keep in mind is that practices must be viewed as "a system and not as siloes" (ibid). Again, the unit of analysis is the practices, not the performer of them. Following Reckwitz (2002) the individual is rather seen as the 'carrier' of practices. Although de-centering the individual, practice theory is not deterministic, but rather views individuals as active social agents who at once follow the rules and norms inherit in practices, but also creatively reproduces and transforms them (Seyfang et al 2010). As the development, diffusion and dissolution of any practice depends on populations of more or less faithful 'carriers' or practitioners, it becomes necessary to examine how people become carriers of practices and how practices spread through communities and social networks (Shove et al 2012).

Shove et al (2012) remind us that when speaking of how practices spread between practitioners, we need to proceed as if the practices we discuss are stable entities, even though the purpose is to discuss how recruitment and defection of practices can have transformative effects. One way to solve this, the authors argue, is to switch between talking about the social life of the practitioners and that of the practices they carry, and thus be able to: "talk about social relations in which persons and practices change, re-produce, and transform each other" (Lave and Wenger 1991 in Shove et al 2012:66). This study will adopt such an approach.

Additionally, Shove et al (2012) argue that whether practices 'recruit' practitioners or not depends on to what degree its constituting elements are

distributed, their position in relation to other practices and "on the characteristics of the social networks through which they circulate, and which they also constitute" (2012:78). We have already touched upon the former two, but especially relevant for this study is the latter. The authors argue that social ties between people are imperative for how individuals are recruited to new practices. Access to a social network of practitioners is also important for sustaining or leaving old practices. As an example, Kennedy (2011) shows how it is likely that those with eating and energy practices that are less materially intensive have access to a social network of other sustainable consumers in their neighborhood. Kennedy (2011:853) argues that such a network of practitioners creates a "virtuous circle", where sharing of knowledge and resources and the development of alternative norms enable members of the network to decrease their consumption and also remove some of the structural barriers for reducing consumption in their neighborhood, thus facilitating reduction in consumption also for non-members

Likewise, Sahakian and Wilhite (2014:30-31) argue that one way practices spread and enable change is through social learning, a process involving engagement in and with new practices. They adopt Lave and Wenger's (1991) understanding of learning as an inherently social process, where cognitive and practical processes lead to acquisition of practical knowledge. Understanding learning as participatory and social implies that learning evolves not so much from acquisition of knowledge by individuals, but from a process of social participation. Lave and Wenger thus argue that learning takes place in 'communities of practice', where "participants share understandings concerning what they are doing and what that means in their lives and for their communities" (1991:98). For learning to be successful, they continue, it must entail two stages: an understanding of what you will learn followed by participation in the practice. Sahakian and Wilhite argue that the first part, the learning proposition, too often in public policies "is based on a

narrow understanding of what is meaningful to people in their everyday lives" (2014:31). Vague and abstract goals of sustainability fail to link up with relevant social practices. The latter part of the learning process, taking part in the practices themselves, is also seldom an offer. The TM, however, engages in both stages. The groups are active in reframing which practices should be learned, and in inviting people to take part in doing these practices in a community of practitioners.

Shove et al (2012), drawing again on Bourdieu and his notion of different forms of capital restricting and enabling the choices available for individuals, argue that the chances of becoming the carrier of any one practice are "closely related to the social and symbolic significance of participation and to highly structured and vastly different opportunities to accumulate and amass the different types of capital required for, and typically generated by participation" (2012:65). A related common critique against environmentalism, and one also pointed out within the TM (Smith 2011), is that it risks remaining a middle class preserve and thereby excluding other groups of society. To explore whether the Transition initiatives fall victim of this critique, it will be necessary to look at the socio-demographic characteristics of participants and their strategies for recruiting and including new participants. Wenger (1998:72-85) asserts that practice and community mutually constitute and create each other over time. Shove et al interprets this as a factor in explaining why top-down initiatives often fail to realize its intentions: "if communities of practice are born of the experience of doing, they cannot be willed into existence or designed from afar" (2012:68). Yet the authors also problematize how such a view leads to an impasse in understanding how practices spread, and remind us that people engage in many practices and hence belong to multiple communities simultaneously. As a consequence there is also a need to look at how individuals involved join or leave different communities of practice. For this we turn to the theory of social movements.

4.2 Social movement theory

Researching social movements and their potential ability to provide transformative change within societies has a long tradition in the social sciences. Movements are "studied for what they signify about broader socio-economic and cultural change and for their relations to states, markets and cultures" (Smith 2012:14). Defining a social movement has proved challenging within the literature, as movements by nature are highly diverse, shaped by historical and cultural context, and also in continuous change. Most definitions highlight the collectivity of movements; defining movements as a "collective actor" (Scott 1990:6), constituted by individuals that share common interests and to some degree a collective identity. Scott (ibid) notes two main features that distinguish social movements from other collective actors: the use or threat of mass mobilization as their prime source of social sanction and power, and their chief concern being to defend or change a society, or a group's position within that society. Some sort of protest as a method is also often included in definitions (Crossley 2002).

Although not necessarily fitting all the common notions of a social movement (we will return to why not), several scholars have found social movement theories useful for understanding the development of grassroots environmental groups (Smith 2012, Reeves et al 2014), including those of the TM (North 2011, Hardt 2013). For my study, the most relevant aspect of this larger body of theory is to understand the formation and mobilization of participants. Naturally, these are processes that constantly influence each other, but within the SMT literature an analytical distinction between movement identities (*why* do they mobilize?) and their strategies (*how* do they mobilize?) has become well-accepted (North 2011)—and will also be followed here.

4.2.1 Placing the TM within the literature

When the Transition Movement sometimes is seen as falling outside definitions of social movements, it is often because of its rather unorthodox methods of neither protesting against nor lobbying external power holders. This view can be seen in relation to a theory strand with great influence in social movement theory, resource mobilization theory (RM). It developed mainly in the US in the 1960s-80s, with Mancur Olson (1965) and Anthony Oberschall (1973) as important contributors. Building on their work, RM scholars assume that movements emerge through rational action and structural opportunities (Scott 1990). RM understand movements as a purposive seeking of interests, and stress the importance of the ability of activists to mobilize and coordinate resources from external elite sympathizers, in order to confront power and influence political processes (Crossley 2002) and to succeed in mobilizing participants (Klandermans and Staggenborg 2002). Grown out of RM, and partly in reaction to it, political process theory (PP), with Doug McAdam (1985) as an important contributor, emphasize that movements are not necessarily dependent on elite sympathizers to provide resources and open doors, but will rather emerge when opportunities in the political system open (North 2011). Thus a movement's success depends on a wider range of structural conditions including, but not restricted to, securing political alliances, access to policy institutions and public opinion (Smith 2012). Although the theories over time have come to also somewhat include questions of human agency and culture in its analysis of movements, both PP and RM ultimately place a particular importance on social movements as challengers of power holders, of conditions given from the governing of markets and policies (Crossley 2002, Smith 2012, Hardt 2013). This is relevant for how scholars view the potential of movements to create societal change: "As movements are seen to be targeting political institutions and authorities, movement success is

judged based on their impact on government policy or legislation" (Hardt 2013:7).

This might help explain some of the criticism against the TM. While recognizing the important roles of national governments and international bodies, the TM seeks neither confrontation nor extensive partnership with these. Their focus is on collective community activity, and on building alternative systems rather than simply opposing existing ones. Although local TM initiatives are encouraged by the Transition Network to seek links with their local governments, the do it yourself-approach is deeply entrenched in the movement (Felicetti 2013). Rather than contesting authorities or powerful business interests, the movement seems to assume that the existing unsustainable regime will collapse or wither away, leaving space open for the sustainable alternatives produced by the communities and the movement (North 2011). This reluctance to confronting power and structural realities has led to a critique of the TM for being naïve, and for failing to focus on the root causes of the modernity crisis the movement seeks to respond to: capitalist, consumerist economies (Trapese 2008). Similar critique is often appointed to local groups in general, which are said both to have little national or transnational influence and to fail to counter the broader institutional and structural dynamics that foster unsustainable ways of living (Litfin 2009).

Although still influential approaches, RM and PP have been challenged for being overly structural, for locating power mainly with elites, for their assumptions of rational actors in a social world and their neglect of socio-political context, movement identities and culture in analyzing group formation (Crossley 2002, Bate et al 2005, Scott 1990). RM and PP, with their central focus on the State as site for contestation and change, may offer important insights into the contextual power relations the TM is working within and the potential limitations for the movement's impact. However, as TM to a small degree cooperate with, or protest against, governments the

theories seem little helpful in analyzing how the movement works to create change. Also, RM scholars do not delve too much into questions of 'why' movements emerge (Crossley 2002: 153). From their view, strain and grievances are viewed to be more or less constant, and thus it is more a shift in resources that explain the rise of struggle (ibid: 79-82).

4.2.2 Grieveances and identities: Why do they mobilize?

In contrast to RM and PP, the theoretical strand of new social movement theory (NSM) place less emphasis on the structural aspects and instrumentality of movements, and rather seek to understand movements emerging because of grievances shaped by different modernity crises in contemporary capitalist societies, and/or as manifestations of post-materialist values, concerned with identity, culture and meaning (Scott 1990, Crossley 2002, Smith 2012). NSM developed mainly in Europe in the 1970s and onward, as a result of classical Marxism's inability to explain emerging social movements such as feminism, environmentalism, the peace movement and that of non-consumerist lifestyles, which did not fit the explanations of class struggle and tended to emerge from the middle rather than working class constituencies (Crossley 2002, Seyfang et al 2010). Important contributors are Alan Touraine (1981), Jurgen Habermas (1987) and Alberto Melucci (1986, 1995). Culture and identity are by NSM scholars seen as central in generating and sustaining movements (Bate et al 2005). Identity is here understood as a changing entity rather than one inherent in a societal position. A key scholar in developing the notion of 'collective identity', Alberto Melucci, argue that part of the work of social movements lies in the creation of collective identities and identification of or formation of group interests (Melucci 1995). He further argues that formation of collective identities is a negotiated process where individuals recognize that they share certain ideas, desires or values and on that basis decides to act together: "Collective identity is an interactive and shared definition produced by several

individuals (..) and concerned with the orientations of action and the field of opportunities and constraints in which the action takes place" (Melucci 1995:44). Accordingly, part of the formation of collective identities is also shaped by relations to external actors, both allies and competitors.

What some scholars have termed the "cultural turn" (Klandermans and Staggenborg 2002:xii) in social movement literature has opened up for a well of contributions embracing the analysis of culture to understand unresolved questions of emergence and mobilization. Still, Scott (1990) is critical towards what he calls the "culturalist" (1990:131) approach in analyzing new social movements, where the emphasis is put on lifestyles and relationships rather than political demands and political change. He opposes the distinction many scholars draw between the so-called old and new social movements, and argues instead that culture is inherently political, in the sense that achieving change in lifestyles necessarily involves political emancipation. Although new social movements articulate 'new' issues and have a 'new' social base, they continue, he argues, the project of older movements: "In so far as all social movements are concerned to effect social change they are bound to argue for new unconventional practices and politicize areas of activity previously thought of as personal" (1990:143). Alvarez et al (1998) argue that the struggle of any social movement is inherently *both* cultural and political. "Culture is political because meanings are constitutive of processes that, implicitly or explicitly, seek to redefine social power" (ibid:7). However, 'culture' itself is an often imprecise term. Alvarez et al (1998:2-5) discuss the various understandings of culture within the social sciences and the humanities, noting two differing notions of the concept among scholars, where some emphasize the textuality and meaning central to culture, while others emphasize the material practices culture is grounded in—when in fact, the authors argue, it can be understood as both: Culture is "a set of material practices which constitute meanings, values and subjectivities" (Jordan and Weedon 1995 in

Alvarez et al 1998:3). From this view, through creating alternative practices, social movements are both challenging mainstream practices and their attached meanings or norms. Through this lens, results of movements cannot be measured in relation to government legislation, political process or institutions "as they are aimed at broader societal and cultural transformation" (Hardt 2013:9). Seyfang et al (2010) and Smith (2012) argue that precisely because of this, NSM can be useful to understand the role of social movements in contemporary energy transition processes, including when looking at the TM.

4.2.3 Social networks and framing: How do they mobilize?

Emerging from the RM tradition, but also developed by NSM scholars, the importance of social networks for understanding mobilization has been given great attention by movement scholars. From a network perspective, relations between (and not only attributes of) individual actors becomes important, as individuals are seen to develop characteristics from their interaction with others (Levoke and Wakefield 2014:304). Thus networks are increasingly understood to be central for social movement mobilization within the literature (ibid). Crossley (2002:93-103) gives an overview of the network argument within the literature: Oberschall (1973) argues that many movements will grow out of existing networks, communities or organizations, where bonds of solidarity, lines of communication and places to meet are already present and established. Crossley (2002:95-96) points to a lot of empirical work supporting this hypothesis, among others studies which found pre-established networks of friendship or the like to be the most common explanation of how movement participants had come to join different movements. Crossley (2002:96) also refers to studies that argue that tightly knit communities or networks are more likely to identify a shared grievance or problem, and also to mobilize around it. If the networks also share a collective identity, as outlined in the former section, the likeliness for mobilization increases even more. Relatedly, Opp

and Gern (1993) found personal ties to be an important push factor for people to participate in protests in the former East Germany in 1989. At the same time, however, Opp and Gern found individual political dispositions to affect networks formation in the first place:

> If the initial interactions [between two persons] convey similar political views, step-by-step communication may begin that results in the recognition of the partner's critical views and may lead to the establishment of a personal relationship (1993:662).

The authors find that the "critical personal networks" (ibid:663) crucial for increasing the number of participants in demonstrations were shaped through two different mechanisms: an increase of incentives in existing networks and an increase in the formation of new, politically homogenous networks. This indicates that social networks can in many circumstances be "as much products as producers of social movements" (Crossley 2002:95). Thus networking can also be a politically driven process.

Relatedly, Diani (2002:174) argues that "social ties originate from action as much as they constrain it", and thus the shape of a social network can also be seen as the outcome of network-building strategies. The network structure of social movements is, however, often multifaceted and complex, with multiple linkages, both direct and indirect (ibid). Although some of the linkages to external actors of the two TM groups to be studied are outlined in chapter 2.1.3, this is mainly to contribute to the contextual understanding of the cases. What is more relevant for answering the research questions posed, is whether and how networks play a significant role in the mobilization of participants for the two TM groups.

Another concept that can further help us understand social movement mobilization, also developed by scholars within both RM and NSM, is the importance of 'framing'. 'Framing' is a concept used by scholars to describe how different perceptions of events lead us to interpret these events differently and consequently affect how we act in response (Crossley 2002). Frames are

interpretative schema "that enable participants to locate, perceive and label occurrences" (Goffman 1974 in Snow et al. 1986:464), consequently frames indicate what is important and not, and attribute blame and responsibility. Frames are both individual and social, made by us and for us; "a frame is an individually held cognitive schema, but is important in collective action only insofar as it is shared by enough individuals to channel their behaviors in shared and patterned ways" (Johnston 2002:66). Such movement framing processes, where movement actors actively engage in the production and maintenance of meaning, result in what social movement scholars term 'collective action frames'. These frames often differ from and challenge existing ways of understanding and acting. Collective action frames make sense of events in ways that highlight a collective set of values, concerns and goals for some sort of change (Martin 2013): "that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of social movement organizations" (Benford and Snow 2000: 614). In this way, they can be seen as part of a mobilization strategy of the movements. In fact, social networks and framing processes are by most SMT scholars viewed to constitute each other: While networks offer arenas for the production and diffusion of frames, the networks are also produced and transformed through the frames and by practices circulating through them (Rutland 2013:221).

Swensen (2012) argues that framing climate change differently can be a successful way of reaching out to people. He argues that when politicians and other actors continue to frame the challenges connected to global environmental change as concerns of 'climate', it is perceived as something abstract, technical and global, and that there is a need to return the focus to 'environment' and national and local measures, in order to increase engagement and ownership among citizens (ibid:19). He also argues that such a "reframing" may contribute to a shift from exclusively top-down measures towards more bottom-up solutions (ibid:22). Nordgaard (2011) comes to

similar conclusions, although from a slightly different angle, in an ethnographic study of a Norwegian rural community and how they understand and relate to the concept climate change. She argues that when confronted with 'troubling information', privileged people in industrialized societies react with what she calls 'socially organized denial' (2011:211); a process of norm creation and reproduction of cultural mechanisms that enables one to 'continue as before' faced with a threat which one as individuals cannot control: "It is not a rejection of information per se, but the failure to integrate this knowledge into everyday life or to transform it into social action" (2011:11), Nordgaard argues. She also argues that climate change thus represents a fundamental challenge to democracy, as "individuals withdraw from the political as a self-protective response" (2011:226). Yet she sees a promising development in social movements emerging based on a return to the local, engaging communities in uncovering how climate change manifests in their local contexts and how they can respond. This, she argues, may "reduce the gaps between abstract information and daily life, decrease the sense of a double reality and bring home impacts in economic, infrastructural and physical terms" (2011:227-28).

A useful way of analyzing collective action frames of social movements, particularly of territorially defined movements, Martin (2013:87) argues is to highlight the discourse and practices that represent the place or places the movement engage with. What she calls "place frames" can be a useful framework in the study of the frames of local Transition groups, as they both work within a territorially defined area and use 'place' actively for mobilizing purposes. Martin translates the three core analytical elements of collective action frames outlined by Snow and Benford (1988 in Martin 2013:89) into dealing specifically with place. First is the *motivational* place framing, which refers to the concerns the collective group gather around and the experiences that form common and shared place meanings. Second is the

diagnostic place framing, which refer to the identification of the problems in relation to specific places. Diagnostic place framings also contain demands, a normative ideal of what a place should be like. Third is the *prognostic* place framing, which identify the solution to the problems, including actions that must be taken. Together, these place frames provide participants with a common understanding of who they are, their difference from others and the merits of their cause. Furthermore, Martin (2013:90) argues that the focus should not be on "place as some fixed entity, but on ideas of place as a grounding or situatedness for some sort of activism", a conceptualization of 'place' we will return to in the next section. Using these three categories to analyze how the Transition groups "produce place as bases for and sites of contestation" (ibid), how they act in accordance with and how they talk about it, can help us understand how they understand themselves and also how they mobilize new members.

4.3 A synthesis: Habitus and creating alternative places

From a SPT perspective, energy-related habits or practices are rooted in cultural and material structures, some more deeply than others. From a NSM perspective, social movements aim for cultural transformation of these practices and their related norms. Combining insights from SPT and NSM can therefore help us understand how social movements work to transform dominant cultural practices and norms that have implications for energy-related consumption, by inventing alternative practices.

Nick Crossley (2002:173-75) identifies four areas of movement theory that he argues overlap with and can be better informed by Bourdieu's notion of habitus. First, he argues that habitus helps us understand "the importance of individual and group lifeworlds in shaping action" (2002:173), meaning that human behavior is partly stipulated on our individual and collective perceptions and evaluations of the world. Thus the grievances that social

movements mobilize around will only serve the cause if they disrupt the structure of these lifeworlds (ibid). Linked to this, and second, habitus can help explain the workings of 'framings' by examining how social movements engage with the habitus of the people they wish to reach, using Bourdieu's understanding of habitus as something that differs between specific social groups and classes.

Third, Crossley argues that a conception of agency "rooted in the concept of the habitus" (ibid:175) could help us understand why the middle classes (or the habitus of middle classes) are more prone to get involved in social movements, by examining how social agents are embedded in different socio-political and cultural contexts. The educated middle class will for example often grow up and stay in an environment where the know-how of political action is pronounced. This resonates with Crossley's last and fourth point of overlap; how habitus can help explain the tendency found in movement theory—that involvement in movement and political activity seems to foster further political involvement.

Crossley resonates many scholars of practice theory when he argues that individuals' agency is partly located in habits learned through socializing, which is again shaped by wider socio-cultural context. He argues:

> It is for this reason that specific frames can be resonant or not, and that some hardships will count as grievances or strains for some groups, where others may not. It is also for this reason (..) that social movements can have a biographical impact: because they are one context within which certain structures of the habitus may be remade (Crossley 2002:175).

Here Crossley argues that the concept of habitus reminds us that people can be shaped by significant events and thus are not merely rational beings approaching each event in the same rational and utility-maximizing fashion. This view has two important implications for assumptions often underlying sustainable consumption policies. First, individuals are not instrumental rational actors that will not be influenced by the structures surrounding them,

nor are the structures detrimental for their actions. Second, social movements can contribute to reshape these very actions and structures, by engaging with actors' habitus and acting as communities of practice. Through social learning the habitus of participants are engaged and transformed. Communities of practice are thus different from communities of interest or communities of geographic proximity (Wenger 1998:74)—in that participants commit to an identity defined by a shared domain of interest, but that they also build relationships that enable them to learn from each other in order to pursue this interest and that they develop a shared practice of experiences, stories, tools and other resources of how to 'do' the practices they engage with (ibid).

To look at how movements may become such communities of practice, it can be useful to conceive of social movements as a social space, or place[18], in which actors interact; what Fine (1995) calls "staging areas for behavior" (1995:129). In this view, social movements provide an alternative place where behaviors and forms of talk are judged to be appropriate and/or encouraged (ibid), and where alternative and sustainable ideas and practices can take form and be nourished (Smith 2012). To better understand how movements create such places, we can incorporate insights from SPT. Cresswell (2004:33-39) discuss how from a structuration theory perspective (Giddens 1984), place is understood as both providing a set of structures, but also as continuously being reproduced and changed by human agency, and thus it never is 'finished', but constantly being performed and constructed by people 'doing things':

> Thinking of place as performed and practiced can help us think of place in radically open and non-essentialized ways where place is constantly struggled over and reimagined in practical ways. Place is the raw material for the creative production of identity rather than an *a priori* label for identity. Place provides the conditions of possibility for creative social practice (Cresswell 2004:39)

[18] The difference between 'place' and 'space' as conceptualized by human geographers, which might be the discipline having devoted the most time to understanding the concepts, is that 'space' is a more abstract realm, becoming a 'place' when humans attach some form of meaning to it (Cresswell 2004:9-10). Although origin to some confusion, concepts such as 'social space', or 'socially produced space', thus in many ways plays the same role as 'place' (ibid). This thesis will use 'place' in this same sense.

Thus through innovating social practices, social movements can occupy and transform existing places and their attached meanings and identities. In this view, referring back to Scott (1990) and Alvarez et al (1998), innovating social practices is also inherently political, as it is part of a struggle over place and its meanings. Likewise, Kennedy (2011) resonates with both scholars of NSM and SPT when she argues that:

> At the neighborhood level, norms can be conveyed through conspicuous practices of consumption, waste and leisure. However, for this form of communication to be effective, it is necessary that public meeting points exist to bring private actions into the public sphere (Kennedy 2011:844).

By challenging predominant practices and norms in order to reduce consumption in a collective manner, social movements politicize everyday life and potentially contribute to a vital piece of cultural change (ibid, Alvarez et al 1998). Wider structural change may thus become a consequence or a requirement of the movement (Smith 2012), as the movement creates alternative social and political places for action.

4.4 Summary

We understand that changing societal structures is necessary if we as society are to develop more sustainable consumption outcomes. We also understand that individuals have limited capacity to change societal structures. The two theoretical approaches presented in this chapter present different solutions to this challenge.

Through the lens of social practice theory, social change occurs through making and breaking links between the elements constituting practices, and hence through practitioners' transformation of old practices and uptake of new, more sustainable practices. Social relations, socio-cultural norms and material infrastructures are as determining as the individual when it comes to changing

consumption patterns, seeing as all are intrinsic to the performance of social practices (Hargreaves 2011:82). What some scholars then argue, is that community-led approaches aid and support individuals in collectively changing their practices, while also empowering others to do the same (Hielscher et al. 2011). Consequently, by changing practices on a larger scale, community-led activities can thus actually help change the context. From this view, the TM can create social change by involving people in changing everyday practices in a more sustainable direction.

Through the lens of social movement theory, social change occurs through collective action inspired and shaped by cultural and structural factors and processes. Social movements problematize the ways in which we live our lives and call for changes in our habits of thought, action and interpretation (Bate et al 2005:12). SMT can help us understand processes of movement mobilization and participation and their cultural and political effects. From this view, the TM can create social change by reframing the challenge and engaging people in collective, local practices that may reduce the gap between abstract information and daily life, and thus contribute to a larger mobilization of people and a greater diffusion of sustainable hands-on practices.

The two theories thus understand processes of social change differently, but can be found to complement each other in the study of a movement such as the Transition Movement.

5. Formation of TM groups: How and why do they join?

Having established a theoretical framework for analysis, presented the groups and practices to be scrutinized and the methods applied in doing so, I will in the following two chapters provide an analysis. This first chapter will present, discuss and analyze empirical findings in order to answer the first research question: How and why have the two TM groups formed and through which mechanisms and strategies do they mobilize participants?

Applying perspectives from social movement theory, outlined in chapter 4.2, I will here understand formation as a process influenced by collective identity formation, and understand mobilization of participants as a process influenced by networks and framing – remembering that both processes mutually constitute each other. Combining insights from social practice- and movement theory, participant's habitus also becomes important for formation and mobilization of movements.

I will first examine the demographic composition of the two TM groups, to see how they have formed so far. I will also study personal characteristics of the participants for this purpose, and discuss whether the participants to some extent share a collective identity. I will examine participants' motivation for joining and see whether they share a common cause, before I turn to questions of how participants come to join the groups and the groups' mobilization strategies. The two groups will be consistently compared throughout the text. I will treat both cases as unique studies, drawing analytical conclusions for each case in addition to across cases.

5.1 Demographics: Just another middle class preserve?

A clear majority of the participants in Bærekraftige Liv på Landås (BLL) live within the area defined by the group, according to both respondents

(Haukeland and Bradtzæg 2012)[19] and informants. Of those who do not, a majority live close by. The participants are thus largely neighbors, or at least belong to the same community geographically. The survey (ibid) finds a majority of female, ethnic Norwegians among the participants, with a relatively high household income, of which a clear majority are within the age groups of 30-49 years (70%). These findings coincide with the descriptions of the informants, although a majority of the informants added that few participants are single and most of them have smaller children – they are typically families. Still, the lack of youth and young adult participants (aged 15-29) is a clear finding from the survey and interviews as well as observation.

In Omstilling Sagene (OS), the picture is somewhat different. Here, a slightly less than a third of the respondents actually live in Sagene, a finding supported by informants and observation, as many live in other parts of the city and travel to and from meetings and activities. The participants are thus seldom part of the same geographical community. The majority of the participants are between 20-29 years old, with a generally lower income level than within BLL[20], and through informants and observation we find that very few have children. While the majority also here is women, a striking feature of OS is the high number of participants from foreign countries, mostly Western Europe and North America. Of the respondents, slightly less than a third said they were not ethnically Norwegian, but from interviews, observation and cross-tabulating survey categories of nationality and degree of participation the share of foreigners among active participants is likely to be even higher[21].

---

[19] As noted in chapter 3, all survey data concerning BLL reported in this thesis is secondary data from a report of a survey made by Telemark Research Institute (Haukeland and Bradtzæg 2012). For readability, the report will not be referred to every time its findings are noted.

[20] Still, a majority of the OS respondents has higher education. Education level was not a question in the BLL survey, but according to statistics presented in chapter 2.2.1 and informants it is arguably high also within BLL. The explanation for the difference in income levels between OS and BLL is likely to be related to the fact that the average BLL participant is older and also more likely part of a family, whereas many OS respondents are closer to student age and more likely to be single households (the income level is measured at household level).

[21] One possible explanation for the lower turnout in the survey than what informants say and observation show can be that the survey was written in Norwegian. From observation, many of the foreigners participating in OS

There are thus both demographical similarities and differences between the two groups. Common features are a majority of Western, middleclass citizens among the participants. Such a finding risk falling victim of a common critique against environmentalism, and also of TM, noted in chapter 4.1.3: Participation in the groups is reserved for the highly-educated middle class. However, taking the general demographic composition of Landås and Sagene outlined in chapter 2.1.1 into account, the two groups reflect the demographic realities in their respective areas. Like Sagene, OS has a majority of young, highly educated participants. Still, the lack of more elderly and families do make the group somewhat skewed compared to the realities on the ground. At the same time, the majority of participants do not live in Sagene, but come from other parts of the city. For BLL, the group's composition corresponds with Landås demographics in that it has a majority of highly educated middle-aged participants, yet they lack younger, elderly and lower income households in order to be fully representative of their area. The different demographics of the two groups can thus to some degree be explained by the different demographic composition of the two areas. At the same time it seems clear that both groups are somewhat overly homogenous to fully represent the diversity in their areas.

Crossley's argument for agency being rooted in habitus, as discussed in chapter 4.3, can shed light on this. He argues that an educated middle class

---

speak Norwegian, but several do not and will consequently be excluded from participating in the survey. Another explanation can be that a majority of the respondents have only participated in few of OS' activities and from observation, a majority of the participants in the core group, meaning they participate frequently, are foreigners. Cross tabulating the survey variables of foreign nationality and how often they participate in activities, we also find that a majority of the foreign participant have participated often, whereas the large majority of the participants who have only participated a few times are Norwegian.

will often grow up and stay in an environment where the know-how of political action becomes embedded in their dispositions for acting. Indeed, when explaining their motivations for participating (which we will return to shortly), a few of the BLL informants mentioned growing up at smaller places with tightly knit communities, while many more mentioned growing up in families with strong values of frugality and/or community. Few of the OS informants noted similar backgrounds as a motivation for joining, a majority did however note their former experience of volunteering. This resonates somewhat with another point of Crossley: Habitus can explain why involvement in volunteer or political work often seems to foster further involvement.

The degree of former/other volunteer activity among participants is however varied within both BLL and OS, according to the surveys. Slightly more than half of the respondents in both groups have experience with volunteer work, whereas the rest has had relatively little experience or no experience at all. A nuance provided by the interviews is that many informants from BLL report being or having been involved in local sports, church and/or school activities, however close to none of them have been active in the more established environmental movement, understood as the more formal and larger environmental organizations[22]. In contrast, several of the informants from OS have been involved with environmental organizations earlier. These are mainly organizations either at community scales (e.g. local recycling projects) or in organizations emphasizing sustainable lifestyles, solidarity with poorer countries and green consumption (e.g. FIVH), rather than focusing on technological solutions and regulations. From a habitus perspective, some of the participants in both groups thus have dispositions for participating in volunteer work and engaging personally in societal questions at a local level.

[22] Although one of the informants participated in a youth organization, Natur og Ungdom, when teenager.

Looking at the demographic composition of the respective areas while combining it with an understanding of the participants' family background and former volunteer experience from a habitus perspective, can contribute to explaining the formation of the two TM groups. However, there is at the same time a minority that does not represent a middle class background nor has a history of volunteering work. To fully explain formation, we thus need to look closer at other characteristics of the participants, their motivation to join and how they came to join.

5.2 Characteristic features: Pragmatic, practical and conscientious

When it comes to personal characteristics of participants, both the surveys and interviews indicate strong feelings of responsibility and valuation of 'the good life' as a lifestyle with low material footprint, among the majority of participants in both groups. When confronted with statements such as that consumption must be reduced in order to protect natural resources, that one personally feels responsible for increased consumption and 'climate crisis', and that there is no antagonism between reduced consumption and increased quality of life—a clear majority of the respondents within both groups give their consent. There is also a tendency of trusting local solutions to global problems within both groups. A majority of the respondents within both BLL and OS disagree with the statement 'The climate crisis cannot be solved locally. It is up to national and international politicians' (although OS to a greater extent than BLL).

At the same time, there is a marked tendency among the BLL informants not to identify themselves with the more established environmental organizations[23], which they characterize as "radical" (#8), "dogmatic" (#7) and

[23] Bortne et al (2002:118) argue that the "core" environmental movement in Norway consists of certain established organizations that are the ones people generally associate with the environmental movement and the ones you assume people will engage in if they are interested in becoming environmental activists: NNV, WWF, NU, FIVH, NMF, Greenpeace, Bellona. When asked what they meant with "the environmental movement", all informants named some of these organizations.

"exclusionary" (#1). All informants recognize the importance and necessity of working with environmental issues at superior geographical and governance levels where these organizations are perceived to put most of their efforts, but they also see BLL as a necessary addition to this work. BLL is perceived by all the informants to have greater potential in reaching a broader segment of the public, with its focus on concrete action, having fun and socializing, and not "only on problems" (#2). In this way it is seen to avoid what is seen as another problem with the more established environmental movement—that of "preaching exclusively to its own constituency" (#1). In addition, BLL is by a majority of the informants perceived to be more including and open than the more formal organizations, which are seen to be for "extremists" (#7) and/or "experts" (#6).

A majority of the OS informants share the BLL informants' felt distance to the more established environmental movement, but explain it more in terms of an impatience with "abstract, bureaucratic processes" (#13) and "only talk and no action" (#15), and a desire to instead do "spesific, practical activities" (#14) "connected to one's everyday life" (#12). Also here, all informants recognize the work of the organizations as important, but see the role of OS as a necessary supplement in order to engage people in their everyday life. In an informal conversation at one of their meetings, an OS participant put it like this:

> I used to be a member of FIVH, but I grew tired of what I felt was a duality between *us* and *them*; us, the members of the environmental movement who knew the "truth" and acted correctly and them, all the other people who didn't know anything and were acting destructively toeards the planet. We just talked about depressing stuff. Whereas in OS, everyone is welcome, its positive and we *do* stuff (#20).

As noted in the previous section, slightly over half of the respondents in both groups have been relatively active in volunteer work earlier. Whereas BLL informants have a history with more general community work, OS informants have a history of environmental work. Notably, the two groups also seem to

mobilize a relatively large share of people who have previously engaged relatively little or not at all in volunteer work. Furthermore, almost none of the informants in either TM group have been directly involved in national or local politics. Lack of involvement in more formal political activity is within both OS and BLL explained by a pragmatic nature ("I need to see both sides of things" (#8, #13), "Being in politics, it's not in my nature" (#9)) or by a lack of trust in politicians' ability to provide the solutions needed ("they don't keep their promises" (#15), "real change must come from the bottom-up" (#6)).

The political affiliation of the respondents from BLL—measured in the survey by the political party voted for in the last municipal election—is also then relatively spread out, although a majority of the group's participants voted for parties of a social-democratic, environmental and/or a liberal profile (Haukeland and Bradtzæg 2012). Compared to the results of the same election for Landås[24] in total (KRD 2011), we see that BLL differ from Landås in its much stronger affiliation with the Socialist Left Party (23 percent for BLL vs. 5,6 percent for Landås in toto) and its very low adherence to the Conservative Party (6 percent for BLL vs 31,7 percent for Landås). The parties with the most votes among BLL respondents are the ones with the clearest environmental profile in the local politics in Bergen. In lack of a baseline survey, it is hard to say whether participation in BLL may have affected the political affiliation of its participants, or whether people with these affiliations are more likely to participate in the group. Yet one exception from the weight of environmental-profile parties is the Labour Party, traditionally decried by the environmental movement for promoting industry over the environment - but still the second largest party among the BLL respondents. If we interpret this last notion as a tendency among many of the respondents to place social

[24] Again, 'Landås' here corresponds to a somewhat different geographic area than what BLL has defined for their purposes. Although this difference must be taken into account in the analysis, for my purpose of describing the context of the case the difference is too small to legitimate further research into it.

values over environmental ones in political affiliation, it correlates with findings drawn from the interviews, where most informants from BLL stressed the importance of solidarity and collective solutions more than environmental values. Also the Socialist Left Party, the biggest party in the survey, often emphasizes solidarity issues stronger than environmental concerns, at least compared to more strictly environmental parties like the Green Party or Byluftslisten, both ranging lower in the survey. In fact, and arguably a correlation, the majority of BLL informants answered negatively when questioned whether they consider themselves as environmentally conscious.

The latter observation radically differs from the informants in OS, whom all answered positively on questions of subjective environmental consciousness. This can also be seen in relation to the political affiliation of the respondents from OS, where an overwhelming 60 percent voted for the Green party (MDG) in the last municipal election. This differs significantly from the political affiliation of Sagene in toto, where only 4,6 percent voted for MDG in the same election (Oslo Kommune 2011). Also here, the majority of the remaining respondents voted for parties with a social-democratic profile and the discrepancy between the votes for the Conservative Party among OS participants and Sagene in toto is large (although so is the gap for most other parties, seeing as MDG got so many of OS's votes). Both OS and BLL have made explicit in their presentation of themselves that they are politically independent, in the sense that the groups have no formal bindings to any political party and want to be open for participants of any political color. Still, we see that particularly OS is far away from representing the political realities on the ground in their area. At the same time, comparing the political affiliation of the group with that of Sagene will inherently be skewed when we know that many of the OS participants come from other parts of the city. In addition, as mentioned for the case of BLL, also for OS the lack of a baseline measure makes it hard to know whether participants have changed their

political affiliation or become more environmental conscious after joining the group, or whether the group attracts such people. Cross tabulating the survey variables of length of participation and party voted for, shows that the ones voting for MDG are rather evenly distributed—and not for example overrepresented—with the ones who has participated the longest. Another correlation worth mentioning however is the degree of former volunteer activity in environmental issues reported by the OS informants and the degree of subjective environmental consciousness, both contrary to those of the BLL informants. Taking part in an organization or volunteer group working with environmental issues, and subjective environmental consciousness, seems to be mutually constitutive. This resonates with an understanding of habitus as former experiences dispositioning future action and understanding.

Both groups thus show signs of a collective identity in formation, recognized first and foremost by its self-defined opposition to the perceived identity of the more formal political and organizational life. According to Melucci (1995) discussed in the former chapter, an important part of forming a collective identity is a shared understanding of the relationship to external actors. Participants in both TM groups define their groups as not only different from the formal environmental movement, but also as a necessary development in order to reach out to a broader segment of the public and to work at the more everyday level, in reaction to contemporary societal problems of climate change and/or social alienation. To this extent, they can also be seen to fit NSM scholars' understanding of social movements as emerging from macro-social structures, as a reaction to a perceived contemporary problem. Still, forming a collective identity also include processes of identifying shared orientations and/or concerns that make the basis for individuals coming together to take action. It seems that OS to a larger degree gather people more concerned about the environment than what BLL does. To be able to scrutinize

this aspect of their different collective identities further we need to look at the motivation of the participants.

5.3 Motives for participation: positive, social, tangible and convenient

Among the BLL-respondents, both creating a tighter community in the neighborhood and doing something positive for the environment score high on importance among respondents when asked of motives for participating in the activities (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012). This is supported by a majority of the informants, who emphasize a "win-win situation" (#4) of getting to know and socialize with people in the neighborhood, while at the same time "contributing one's part" (#4) to acting on climate change. However, among the BLL-informants there is a marked tendency of prioritizing the social or personal benefits of participating over the environmental benefits. The exception is the three initiators of BLL whom, maybe not surprisingly, have a strong environmental motivation. Among the other informants however, only one emphasizes action on global climate change as a large part of the motivation for participating. The rest emphasize either the social gains of increasing ones social network in the neighborhood, or personal gains such as learning skills, doing something meaningful or acting out ones interests, or most often both. The environmental gains are mentioned, but seen by a majority more as a "nice bonus" (#7). Likewise, although the concern for climate change as a motivation is ranked high by many of the respondents in the survey, motives such as creating a social network and a stronger place identity rank even higher. Both in the survey and in interviews, participants also place an importance on creating informative activities for children.

These findings explain further the formation of a collective identity among the BLL participants. The majority of BLL participants share an objective of making Landås a more enjoyable and safer place to live and say they act on the basis of this. Many also share an objective of living less

materially intensive and more environmentally friendly. Still, the BLL participants seem to identify themselves more as a neighborhood group than an environmental group, with a shared interest first and foremost to create a tighter social network and social activities in the neighborhood. When it comes to identifying a common grievance, outlined by many NSM theorists as another source of formation of social movements, we could interpret these findings as a community mobilizing around a shared local grievance of social alienation. At the same time, few of the informants describe social alienation as a problem in their community. In fact, when asked about grievances, informants rather talk about some sort of guilt from leading privileged lifestyles and not knowing what to do with abstract issues such as climate change.

In OS, the survey results show stronger signs of environmental motivation among respondents. Although a majority rank the motive of creating a tighter community in Sagene as relatively important, compared to BLL respondents it scores significantly lower. The same is the case for the motive of wanting to create a sense of belonging to the place one lives, where the result is rather mixed within OS respondents, whereas BLL respondents rank this motive high. In contrast, OS respondents rank the importance of motives such as a concern of climate change, a wish to do something positive for the environment and a wish to gain knowledge on how to live a more environmentally friendly life very high, and higher than BLL respondents. Important to note though, is that a large majority of OS respondents also rank high their motivation of wanting to do environmental activities *together with others*. The OS informants support these findings. Like BLL informants, they also emphasize the dual gains of socializing while contributing positively to environmental issues, but the forms and gains of socializing is arguably different between the two groups. While BLL informants talk of the social gains as getting to know the people in the neighborhood and building a tighter

community, the majority of the OS informants speak of the social gains as getting to know "likeminded" (#15) people, "interested in the same stuff as you are" (#16). This correlates with findings noted earlier in the chapter, that OS participants to a larger extent define themselves as environmental conscious.

Thus we begin to see differing collective identities forming within the two groups. The majority of the OS participants share an orientation first and foremost towards environmental concerns, although the social aspect of the group is important for mobilization too. Unlike BLL, the OS informants seem to define their group as an environmental group. Also in contrast, the shared grievance that OS participants can be said to mobilize around is more a global concern of climate change than a local concern of social alienation. Yet as with BLL, this grievance does not seem to give us a full understanding of their motivation to join – as OS participants see themselves as sharply different from other environmental groups mobilizing around the same issue, and as many of them have not become active in environmental organizations earlier. When asked about grievances also OS informants talk of a feeling of helplessness when confronted with troubling information about climate change.

A common theme present in the motivation of informants from both groups is thus the desire to do something 'concrete' and 'practical'. The initiators of OS all have a background from environmental studies or research, and started the group partly because they were "tired of reading about problems and getting depressed" (#11). In a similar vein, the BLL initiators explain their motivation to start up partly to give themselves and people an action alternative. As one of them puts it: "People today don't lack information about climate change or how bad it is, but they lack alternatives of what to do about it" (#3). Likewise, all of the other informants in both groups noted as part of their motivation to join that working at the local level and with one's

everyday activities reduce the powerlessness they often felt when reading about the scale of global challenges like climate change. Informants told of a positive feeling of "being part of the solution" (#11) and "doing something meaningful" (#8) after joining BLL and OS. Many BLL informants referred to that the BLL initiators at meetings talked about the importance of 'taking the first step in the right direction'. "It feels manageable", one of the BLL informants said, and continued:

> If being told that you have to change your whole lifestyle radically, I think people will feel condemned and turn away. But if you say like BLL does; 'look, here's a lot of things we can do, start with what suits you the best, if we all take one step every day it sums up to a larger change', I think more people are likely to join (#8).

Related, the BLL initiators themselves talked about starting activities within a realm that individuals have certain "sovereignty" (#1) over, namely their own everyday activities.

Applying the theoretical perspectives outlined in chapter 4.3, what the two groups are doing is occupying a place, or social space, and transforming the practices and meanings attached to it. These places are not necessarily Landås or Sagene as geographically defined units, but more in the sense of places where participants act and talk with others when it comes to everyday consumption activities. The groups' engagement in transforming one's own and others everyday consumption and mobility practices is a way of turning something seen by the mainstream society to be a personal sphere into a political sphere. As Scott (1990) argues, outlined in chapter 4.2.2, the cultural thus become political. The common grievance both groups are mobilizing around is the feeling of powerlessness in one's everyday life in confrontation with information of abstract challenges such as climate change and overconsumption – in Crossley's perspective a grievance that arguably disrupts the lifeworlds of the Norwegian middle class (e.g. considering the public opinion polls outlined in chapter 2) and thus serve mobilization purposes. As

Nordgaard (2011) and Swensen (2012) argue, outlined in chapter 4.2.3, translating this information into concrete action alternatives seems to produce the feeling of meaning and accomplishment that many OS and BLL informants report. As one informant puts it:

> At the local level, it is tangible. You see the results of your actions, that they actually make a change. At the same time you get something back, it being happy neighbors or the opportunity to participate in or learning something practical (#6).

The latter point is another common theme in participants' motivation; that participation is characterized as beneficial and pleasurable. The social gains have been mentioned, and so has the personal gain of doing something meaningful, but also other personal gains are part of the motivation of participants. One aspect many of the informants in both groups mention is the desire to learn certain skills. Another aspect mentioned by many in both groups is that it is 'fun'. As one BLL informant describes her involvement in volunteer work: "It has to be something I *want* to do. I have enough things that I *have* to do" (#7). Another BLL participant, a man in his late thirties, noted in an informal conversation: "I got into this for all the 'wrong' reasons. A friend of mine, one of the initiators, said: Let's do something fun. I went in for the fun and suddenly I'm here planning to buy an electric car" (#19).

When the latter participant express a surprise of making an environmental friendly choice it says something about his initial orientations before joining the group, most likely not the most environmental conscious ones. When he describes it as 'wrong' to be in it for the fun, it also says something about his impression of the more established environmental movement as noted above. The description of participation as pleasurable can also be related to another common theme in the motives of participants; convenience, especially among BLL informants, but also to some degree among OS informants. Several of the participants I had informal conversations with during BLL meetings also note it: "I joined because it was such a low threshold, and it's right outside my door. When you come home from work and

you have kids, you don't have the time and energy to go places far away", said a woman in her thirties during one of the meetings (#17). "It is something happening where I live, it kind of feels stupid not to be a part of it", said another, a middle-aged man in a different conversation (#18). Of the OS informants who mentioned convenience as part of their motivation, they all lived in Sagene. Cross tabulating the survey variables of living in Sagene or not, and how often one participates in activities, we find that people living in Sagene or close by participates more often than those who live far away. This can also help explain why more of BLL participants note convenience as motivation, as more of them live in the area where the activities are taking place, and do not have to travel back and forth. In addition to the short distance to activities, another aspect of convenience mentioned by many informants in both groups is the non-binding nature of the groups, their flexible notion of membership that allows participants to participate less in hectic periods in their lives without "feeling guilty" (#6) or "feeling obliged" (#14) to participate.

In some ways, the descriptions above also fits with a changing character of volunteer work in Norway. The TM groups differ from the traditional Nordic model of voluntary organizations based on strong membership relations, broad mobilization and a hierarchical, internal democratic structure, and in some ways fit new trends of volunteer work more centered on self-development and self-realization (Steen-Johnsen and Enjolras 2011). Strong motives of personal gains and of convenience may reflect a group that is turned towards the internal needs of participants, more than societal needs or change. Yet at the same time, OS and BLL motives of social gains for the neighborhood and environmental gains for the planet disrupt this picture somewhat. Thus both personal-related motives and motives related to the cause are present within the two groups.

None of the BLL informants mentioned economic benefits as a motivation, a finding supported by the survey (Haukeland and Brandtzæg

2012), where the importance of economic gains range relatively low compared to other motives for participation[25]. Economic motives score higher among OS respondents. Also a few of the OS informants note the benefit of saving money through growing one's own vegetables and using the bicycle for transportation Yet all the informants who mention economic motives were foreigners. When asked to elaborate, they all mentioned that Norway is expensive compared to their home countries. Cross tabulating the survey variables of nationality and motives of cost savings, we see that a larger part of the foreigner respondents are motivated by economic motives than the Norwegian respondents. The motives of Norwegian participants in the two TM groups thus only to a limited extent are of cost savings, in contrast to findings from TM groups in e.g. Great Britain (Seyfang and Haxeltine 2012). This correlates with literature on energy savings in Norway, where costs has shown to be a weak motive of engaging Norwegians in saving energy (as outlined in chapter 2).

5.4 Mobilization strategies

A majority of the informants from BLL got involved in the group through knowing one of the initiators or someone else participating in the group[26]. Typically they were invited along to an activity by a friend/neighbor and then gradually got more involved. Some of them were also asked directly whether they wanted to join or take on some more responsibility, either face-to-face or by e-mail. The ones who were asked directly noted that this was a major reason for ending up joining; many of them had thought about getting involved for a while already, but not gone to any of the activities yet. As one of them

[25] Economic gains are still added some importance by the respondents in the survey. This difference of findings of interviews and survey can be a result of the small selection of informants, but may also be a result of the direct question posed in the survey. Considering the latter possible explanation, the interviews may serve as a qualifier to the importance placed on the issue; when asked directly some respondents answer positively, but when asked open questions of their motivation, economic benefits are not brought up by the informants themselves.

[26] Questions of how participants joined the group were not part of the survey conducted with BLL and this question will for BLL's case be based mainly on data from interviews and observation.

puts it; “It was the push I needed” (#8). A few of the informants also joined after becoming interested by noticing the BLL-posters in the neighborhood or their activities on social media and thereafter contacting the group. The fact that many joined because they knew someone in the group correlates with earlier findings of the importance participants place on the social aspects of participation in BLL. It also suggests that participants to a large degree are mobilized by way of networks they were already part of.

This finding correlates with what the initiators of BLL explain in that they started out with no clear strategies of how to mobilize people. They began by inviting friends and neighbors over for community dinners and film screenings. They expanded by asking locals they met when picking up their children from school, kindergarden or football practice whether they wanted to come to the next activity. “We were very bold”, said one of the initiators, “we looked people straight in the face and said ‘are you seriously thinking about not coming? It will be great; you’re going to miss out!’” (#1). The initiators also emphasize that they already had a rather large network in the neighborhood after living and working there for many years, and that they used this actively to reach people. They point out a challenge in the beginning convincing people that their activities were independent from the church, seeing as all three of them had worked for or with the local church previously and also because many of their first activities were held at the church premises, as they could lend them for free. The majority of the other informants also mentioned this challenge, especially when speaking of how neighbors not member of BLL talked about the group. Yet the majority of the informants said they believe this to be more of a problem of the past, as the group now has grown to “include so many that are not religious” (#7) and because none of the activities are especially directed towards the church or religious motives. It nonetheless was a learning experience for the initiators. As one of them puts it:

> When we are talking to people in other parts of the city who want to start up similar groups in their neighborhoods, we advise them to first compose a core group of people who have their belonging and credibility in different networks. We grew slowly because the three of us had a pretty similar network. And there are still some people who do not want to join because they think we are the church (#1).

Thus we see that BLL in the beginning formed through existing networks in the neighborhood and that the initiators also used them as an active recruitment strategy. It fits with SMT notions of movements forming less from individuals coming together over a common cause, and more as individuals already together, "transforming their networks into something different" (Crossley 2002:97). Later however, participants have to a certain degree also joined through other strategies such as posters in the neighborhood or use of social media. The initiators have actively used other mobilizing channels than their existing networks, after noticing that having too similar networks became a barrier for recruiting people outside of them. Today, the group has several strategies for reaching out to new and old members. They are active on the social media Facebook, where they update their followers (2966 pr November 2014, yet including people not from Landås) on activities and news from the group, but also on other climate- and environmentally related news and happenings. They have a mailing list where they send out invitations for planned activities and meetings. They also put up posters in the neighborhood notifying about activities. They have been featured in local media several times, partly on their own initiative.

Another mobilization strategy noted by the initiators was to arrange activities in a manner which allows people to join despite the time squeeze of modern lifestyles, as they knew most people in the neighborhood to live hectic lives. Thus activities are arranged either in a way where children can participate, or with someone to babysit a group of children so that their parents can participate in a meeting. As several of the informants noted that this flexibility and convenience was part of their motivation for joining the group

(see the former section), it is likely that such a strategy has played a positive role in recruiting participants. At the same time, data from a few of the informants, respondents and informal conversations indicate that some participants feel that too many of the activities are planned with the largest group among the participants in mind, namely families with small children. As one of them puts it in the survey: "There are a lot of activities for families with children, and those of us who do not have children feel a bit left out" (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012). The initiators explain the somewhat lack of diversity in the group with a strategy of starting with the "low-hanging fruits" (#1), neighbors and the people 'who wants to'. Instead of "using a lot of energy on convincing people who don't want" (#), they hope to grow sufficiently on those who do want to create a momentum that ultimately brings everyone along.

In contrast to the survey within BLL, one question of recruitment was included in the OS survey. Around a third of the respondents of OS discovered the group through a friend or someone they knew. Among the remaining, a majority got to know the group through social media or through participating at an event arranged by OS. Many also found OS through already looking for a Transition movement initiative. Together, the factors where the participants arguably already had an interest and were actively seeking some sort of engagement outweigh the potentially more passive factor of being taken along by a friend – in contrast to the findings for BLL[27]. Thus OS formed less through already existing networks and more through what we in chapter 4.2.3 described as a political driven process. Here, networks are as much an outcome as a precondition for movement formation, as individuals that share a common

[27] As the data on this finding is weaker for the BLL case as a consequence of the lack of a survey measurement, it may be problematic to compare the two cases on this notion. Although acknowledging this, I will argue that other factors, such as that a majority of BLL participants live in the same area, that their motivation for joining is to a large degree based on social networking and that their environmental motivation is lower all speak in favor of the same notion as what BLL informants say of that they joined through knowing someone.

cause come together. This finding is also supported by the informants, where a majority state they were actively looking for an initiative like OS to engage in and subsequently joined. Some of the informants thus pointed to a certain "self-selection" in the recruitment to the group, arguing that since OS is not actively recruiting people to join, only people who are interested in the profile of OS actively join the group, often meaning people who already have strong environmental values:

> The ones who come to OS identify with what we are doing after seeing what we have done. Thus they have reasonable conditions for knowing what we like and want to be associated with. It is sort of a self-selection. (..). The ones who are not like us might not feel that they fit in as well, and so they don't come (#13).

The initiators explain the lack of a more active recruitment with lack of time and resources, but first and foremost with a rationale that the group should be composed by "people who want to do something"(#12): "We don't recruit people, they just come. We're not the kind of group that actively take care of members, people just have to come along and join the parts they want to join" (#11). This is part of a larger model of how to make volunteer work sustainable, to some degree rooted in the Transition Network model of 'let it go where it wants to go' (Hopkins 2013), but also a necessity as the initiators and participants most active in OS all have full time-jobs and no funding for running the group, in contrast to the initiators in BLL (as outlined in chapter 2.1.2). A factor that also should be noted is that the initiators had just moved to Sagene when they started the group, and did thus not have pre-established networks in the neighborhood like the BLL initiators. Like BLL, OS is active on the social media Facebook, where they update their 1038 followers (pr November 2014) on activities and news from the group. They also have a mailing list where they send out invitations for planned activities and meetings.

Important to note is that the OS informants differ between themselves as active volunteers engaged in planning and arranging activities, and the ones

who participate in these activities once or once in a while. Whereas the activities of BLL is mainly directed towards the people living in their demarcated area, the activities of OS is to a larger degree directed towards people from all over Oslo (even though they all take place in Sagene). This correlates with findings noted above of that BLL is largely composed of people from the neighborhood, whereas OS gathers people from all over Oslo. Whereas BLL is located in a more suburban setting with fewer offers of competing activities within short distance and has chosen a smaller area of focus; OS is located almost in the middle of the city with a range of competing activities and has chosen an area five times as big as its focus. A strategy of the group has consequently been to include people in their activities even if they do not live in Sagene and are not be part of OS. An informal conversation I had with two young women in their twenties after a course in fermentation of seasonal vegetables may serve as an interesting example in this regard:

> Researcher (R): Why did you decide to attend the course?
> Woman (W) 1: My friend here stumbled over it on Facebook and it looked fun. She asked me to join and I've for long wanted to learn more about traditional conservation of food.
> R: Do you know that Omstilling Sagene is part of a larger international network?
> W 1+2: No?
> R: Did you know much about Omstilling Sagene before you came?
> W 2: Not really, but it seems like they do a lot of these types of courses. I can't wait to get home and try some of this stuff out.

The recruitment strategies of OS are arguably mobilizing people already interested in environmental concerns, but at the same time they potentially reach out to more people than what the number of participants tells of. In fact, a majority of the informants said that they were not concerned about OS growing to become a larger group. They emphasized keeping the group at a manageable scale and instead arranging activities for others.

We see that existing networks cannot explain fully the recruitment of participants in the two groups, especially not in OS. Although a majority of

BLL participants were recruited through existing networks, some of the participants found out about the group through posters or social media and on that basis decided to join. Within OS, the share which actively sought out or decided to join the group on basis of social media is even larger. In addition, they direct their activities to people all over Oslo. In this way, both groups are creating new networks. Still, remembering that several of the participants have not been engaged in volunteer work earlier, and that a majority do not identify with the more established environmental movement, what is it with these posters or social media platforms that attract participants that are not joining because of existing networks?

Following the framework of 'place frames' of Martin (2013) outlined in chapter 4.2.3, we can analyze the collective action frames of the two groups and how they are using 'place' for fostering collective identities and for mobilization purposes. Synthesizing findings noted in the previous sections, the *motivational* place framing of BLL is dual; there is a shared interest in making Landås a better place to live (social and personal gains) and a shared grievance in the unsustainability of one's lifestyle (environmental and personal gains). BLLs *diagnostic* place framing identifies the problems as unsustainable modern lifestyles in form of overconsumption, lack of infrastructure easing environmentally friendly choices at Landås and lack of action from politicians in form of facilitation for leading more environmentally friendly lives. The *prognostic* place framing in many ways combine the two former, and suggest a solution based on the community coming together to help each other reduce the unsustainability of modern lifestyles while at the same time increasing social and personal gains and influencing others to do the same. The participants are thus themselves framed as part of the solution, in coming together to transform Landås into a more socially- and environmentally friendly place.

The place frames of OS are similar, but nonetheless somewhat different.

The *motivational* place framing of OS is less transforming an existing neighborhood into something new, and more creating a community of likeminded people around leading more sustainable lifestyles. Although making Sagene a better place to live is part of the group's statues, the majority of participants are not so much concerned about Sagene as they are of the planet and of creating a place where they can enact a different vision of everyday life together with others. OS's *diagnostic* place framing thus identifies the problems as individuals leading unsustainable lives of overconsumption and lack of concrete action alternatives and of political will to enforce change. Like BLL, the *prognostic* place framing frames participants as part of the solution; likeminded individuals coming together to develop more sustainable everyday practices and influence others to do the same.

A clear and common feature within both BLL and OS is thus to emphasize that participants in the groups are part of the solution, not only the problem—both when it comes to how the groups present themselves to outsiders (in invitations, presentations, documents[28]), but also how participants understand themselves (reflected in interviews and surveys). This resonates with findings from the previous chapter of the motivation of participants and the common grievance that the groups mobilize around. Both groups also share a philosophy rooted in the TM (Hopkins 2013), of emphasizing "what we want and want more of" (#2) and "not only what we are against" (#11). For example, and in effect distinguishing themselves explicitly from the more established environmental organizations, the slogan of BLL is: "From protest to party!" In both OS' and BLL's invitations for activities, the environmental gains of the activity are often mentioned, but the main focus is on the social

[28] I have not systematically examined or analyzed invitations, internal/external documents and presentations held by the two groups. I have observed one presentation before an external audience for each group, looked at invitations for different activities for each group during participant observation, and I have read how the groups describe themselves in OS annual report and BLLs project application. This is however not a study using discourse analysis as a method and I will restrict my exploration to dissecting a few themes.

gains of the activity (meeting friends and new people) and the personal gains (having fun, learning something new). This correlates with findings noted above.

What the OS and BLL do is to put forward an alternative framing of climate change as not only a challenge, but also an opportunity – a call to create better, happier and safer communities. They offer individuals an opportunity to feel as part of the solution, not only the problem. Following Swensen (2012) and Norgaard (2011), such a framing holds potential in mobilizing people around a shared grievance of feeling powerless in confrontation with troubling information.

5.5 Summary

There are both strong similarities and crucial differences between the two TM groups studied in this chapter. The comparison thus contributes to an understanding of not only the TM movement in Norway in general, but also of local variations and the factors that account for these variations.

First, a synthesis of commonalities: Participants are largely Western, educated, middle class people, strongly valuing notions of solidarity and communalism. They all share the motives of social gains such as getting to know new people and doing activities together with others, and personal gains such as learning skills, having fun and doing something meaningful and concrete that reduces the powerlessness felt in confrontation with troublesome information about climate change. Both groups share a belief in local solutions to global problems. Participants in both groups also define themselves as not only different, but as a necessary addition to the more established environmental movement, which they see as more excluding and radical than their own groups. Both groups also mobilize around a broader set of motives than either mainly local development or environmental consciousness. They have thus succeeded in mobilizing people who don't identify themselves with

and would not join the more established environmental movement, and to a certain degree also succeeded in mobilizing people who have not previously been engaged in local volunteer work.

Yet the groups also differ on various aspects. One is the different demography of the groups; BLL mainly consisting of families with young children and OS of young adults without children. This have partly been explained with the different demographic realities in their respective areas, but also with a certain lack of active recruitment strategies to include new and different groups of people within both BLL and OS. It can also be seen in relation to another difference noted; the fact that BLL participants to a large degree live in the same area, whereas OS participants come from several parts of the city. This has been explained partly by geographic location, choice of scale and also respective recruitment strategies; whereas BLL is located further outside the city center, has focused on a smaller area and recruited people from existing local networks, OS is located more in the middle of the city, has focused on an area approximately five times as big and less actively recruited people in the neighborhood. An additional explanation is that BLL has more actively spread their model to other neighborhoods and advised interested parties from outside of Landås to rather start up something for themselves, whereas OS has let everyone interested join their activities and thus recruited more broadly geographically. A last difference to be noted is the importance placed on environmental motives, which range much higher within OS than BLL. This notion has been explained by a combination of a greater environmental consciousness and a stronger history of environmental volunteering among OS participants, but should also be seen in relation to the factors mentioned above, of how the groups have formed. Put succinctly: OS has become more of a group that environmentally minded people from all over Oslo seek ought, whereas BLL has become more of a neighborhood group that people living at Landås are taken along into.

We know from chapter 4.2 that different SMT schools understand processes of mobilization and criteria of success differently. RM and PP understandings of mobilization as enabled by external support from power holders or openings in the political system cannot explain the growth of the two TM groups in question, as they have formed largely through existing networks of friends and neighbors and bottom-up outreach through social media and posters. Instead, NSM theory can help explain how the TM groups have emerged as a response to a perceived modernity crisis and common grievance of climate change and over-consumption. Instead of directing their actions towards the State or firms, they direct their action towards their own communities. Their outcome should thus not be measured in terms of effect on governmental policy or support, as a RM or PP perspective would emphasize, but more in form of their potential effect on broader cultural transformation within their communities, in line with NSM theory. We thus need to ask: Is the work of the two groups contributing to changing mainstream consumption practices? Do their activities contribute to form new norms and practices, and thus have the potential to actually reduce energy-related consumption? Or do they remain enjoyable and social initiatives – but without any environmental gains? To examine this, we turn to the next part of the analysis, looking at the activities of the groups and to what degree participation contributes to changing energy-related practices or not.

6. Formation of practices: How and why do they change or not?

This chapter will provide the second part of the analysis. I will here present, discuss and analyze empirical findings in order to answer the second research question: How and why are new energy-related social practices developed, and old ones changed or not, in the two groups?

Using a social practice theory (SPT) perspective, outlined in chapter 4.1, practices will here be understood to consist of three interrelated elements: the social (norms and meanings), the material (infrastructure and technology) and the individual (cognitive and embodied knowledge and competences). Changing a practice depends on breaking the links between, and/or changing one or more of, the elements constituting a practice. As norms are seen to be embedded within a practice, the formation of new norms comes from changing one or more of the elements of a practice. Spreading a practice involves processes of social learning and creation of communities of practices. Further, combining insights from SPT and social movement theory show that movements can facilitate this social learning by creating alternative places for it to happen, acting as 'communities of practice' and consequently challenge mainstream norms and practices through collectively innovating alternative practices.

I will first look at how the two TM groups develop their activities and the extent to which they plan for a change in practices and on what level. I will then go through the three chosen practices outlined in chapter 2.2 and examine whether and how the activities of the TM groups contribute to change the practices and/or their attached norms. I will measure this change by looking at two alternative practices for each practice in question, and examine whether participation in the groups increases the uptake of these alternative practices.

6.1 Planning for change

In OS, the planning of activities is divided between three working groups: One group for activities related to food and growing; one group for planning practical workshops and informative events; one group concerned with issues of new and local economy. Also within BLL the planning of activities is divided between working groups. Here, the working groups are more specifically concerned with one topic (e.g. transport) or arranging one type of activity (e.g. food growing, food courses or exchange parties). In both groups, participants choose to join the group he/she is the most interested in, if he/she wants to.

All OS informants explain that the choice of which activities OS engage in more or less boils down to what the participants wants to do or wants to learn. When asked of restrictions for what an activity could entail, a majority mention that the activity should take place in Sagene, but otherwise that participants are free to suggest whatever activity as long as it contributes positively to either the participants, to Sagene or to the planet. The initiators explain this rather informal and open approach with the TM philosophy of 'let it go where it wants to go'. As one of the initiators puts it: "Sometimes people have suggested activities that made us think 'this is too hippie, at least for me' (#11), but by all means, if people want to arrange it we let them do so. OS is open for all". The initiators say that there is only one rule for OS participants in planning activities: if you say you will do something, you should see it through. This rule was made in order to distribute the responsibility and ownership for arranging activities within the group, after a start where much of the responsibility for arranging fell was allocated to the initiators.

In contrast, BLL has a more specific guideline for the content of activities; they need to fulfil the dual objective of both increasing life quality and reducing the ecological foot print of the community. The initiators say that they have turned down proposals for activities that only address one of the two

goals - most often because the activity proposed has been "only for fun" (#2). The initiators of BLL have also been more determined in deciding the profile of the activities they arrange; they say that it has been important for them to not come across as what they term "typical eco-grumps" (#2) in their choice of activities:

> We want to reach another type of people than what most environmental organizations do. So we have been very concerned with choosing topics that most people feel are relevant for their everyday lives. We didn't start out with compost courses; then people would place us in the typical weird environmental people-box. But now, when we've grown and have the profile we do, now we can do those courses without being put in that box (#2).

Compared to OS, the BLL initiators thus exert a larger degree of control over what activities are arranged within the group. Their strategy of choosing activities that reflect their goal of recruiting non-environmental conscious participants has according to findings already presented succeeded. And despite of the more formal rule of the content of an activity, many of the activities still derive, according to informants, from what the participants are interested in doing or in learning, like within OS.

Yet in both groups, the participants also to a certain degree take as a starting point a common grievance or challenge within the local community. As an example, in one of the planning meetings I observed within BLL, one group of participants were discussing how they could promote electrical cars as a substitute for diesel/gasoline cars at Landås. The person who started the discussion had been talking about this issue with neighbors in his building block, where one of his neighbors wanted to buy an electrical car, but met a barrier in that there were no charging stations outside the building block. The group thus started discussing how they could make a plan for facilitating a system of charging stations at Landås. The planning of activities is thus not only a result of participants' wants, but may also come from inspiration from talking with neighbors or others in the community and as a solution to a

collective problem. Likewise, OS started an activity to protest what was perceived as a common grievance of participants in the group: parking lots for cars were prioritized over green public places in Sagene. They thus made a 'trailer-garden', a trailer filled with flowers and plants, and have been placing it at different parking lots around Sagene as a form of protest. OS also arranged an activity to gather the dreams and wishes for the development of Sagene of the people living in the urban district. This was done through creating a 'wish tree' at the public square, where people could write down their aspirations on paper notes and hang them in the tree, and thus also read other people's wishes. Later, OS presented the notes of wishes to the local administration. Thus both groups have shown that they can also function as a focal point for their larger communities, potentially acting as a catalyst for change in these larger communities, and not only within their own.

When asked whether they think their actions within their local communities can have any effect on a larger scale, a majority of the informants in both groups answered positively. Many BLL informants gave a description of Landås as a "laboratory" (#8), where new forms for environment-related community engagement and practices can be tested, for then to be spread to others. Many pointed to concrete developments in this regard, such as the diffusion of TM groups in Bergen and the cooperation between BLL and actors like Transnova and Bergen University College in projects that will promote environmentally friendly choices. Likewise, a majority of the OS informants saw OS having a potential effect outside the borders of Sagene and the group itself, but few pointed to specific developments. Many talked of the potential spreading of knowledge and practice to external people participating at practical courses, or other groups being inspired by their example, but noted that this is hard to measure. At an even larger scale, many of the informants in both groups noted how they saw their local activities connected to a global effort. Notably however, few of them emphasized that they were part of the

TM network. All knew of it, but a majority said that they didn't experience their respective groups to be much connected to the larger network. When speaking of being part of a larger global movement, the majority of informants instead emphasized larger international trends of local solutions and do-it-yourself approaches.

6.2 Food

As explained in more details in chapter 2.2.1, this study will examine two alternative consumption practices promoted by the TM groups, which both have the potential to challenge or change the practice of buying imported foods in the supermarket and such potentially reduce the energy use embedded in the participants' food consumption.

The practice of buying imported foods in the store is from a SPT perspective a combination of a normative context where this is viewed as unproblematic, 'normal' and/or of status, an embedded and cognitive knowledge of how to shop for food and what food to cook, plus the material infrastructure of amongst others prices and availability of different foods and of places to buy food. The first alternative practice to be studied here is to buy local foods instead of imported ones. The second is to grow one's own vegetables instead of buying imported ones.

6.2.1 Buying local

Several of the food-related activities of BLL and OS are directed towards promoting consumption of more local/short-traveled food, as well as ecological food[29]. BLL has arranged different practical courses in cooking with local seasonal root vegetables, and since 2010 a yearly course in carving

[29] Participants in both groups tend to treat local food and ecological food as connected and as equally beneficial for the environment. Although this study focuses mainly on local foods (as outlined in 2.2.1), the following section will treat both foods together: firstly, this is what participants do, and secondly, the surveys deal with both forms of food simultaneously and so both are reflected in the data.

and using all parts of local lamb. The latter course has often been held in cooperation with local farmers or chefs, with the opportunity for participants to order and buy lamb from local producers. The last year, BLL has taken the cooperation with local farmers one step further and initiated what they call 'Matkollektivet', the 'Food Collective'. It is supposed to facilitate consumption of local food by connecting consumers in the neighborhood directly with farmers and producers in the nearby area. As it was not operating yet at the time of this study it will not be a part of the discussion, but it is mentioned in order to give a description of which direction food-related activities are taking within BLL. BLL has also arranged activities concerned with learning to identify eatable plants and eatable seafood in the nature.

OS also arranges activities concerned with identifying eatable plants growing wild at Sagene. OS has not cooperated directly with local farmers for provision of local food to their participants. They did hold one event in cooperation with Oslo Kooperativ however, which similarly to Matkollektivet is a cooperative and distributing system between consumers and local farmers in the Oslo area. OS screened a film concerning local and ecological farming and afterwards Oslo Kooperativ presented their business model. As one of the initiators described it: "People got really excited, thinking 'that's the food I want and these are the people who are going to bring it'. Lots of people got on their mailing list and this was a way for us to contribute, by creating a place for these people to meet" (#12). OS has also arranged cooking courses with seasonal root vegetables, employing traditional conservation techniques like fermentation. The group arranges a monthly pot luck-café where many of the dishes brought is vegetarian and/or made of local and/or ecological foods. From observation, several discussions at these evenings are about food, often concerning benefits of eating local and ecological, like health effects, but also about how it feels meaningful from an environmental perspective.

A majority of the respondents from OS then also agree more than they disagree with the assertion that they buy ecological and local food "provided it is possible". This notion is also true for the respondents from BLL (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012), yet the degree of engagement differ between the two: Of the 69% of BLL-respondents who say they agree to a certain degree with the statement of 'buying ecological and local food'; 17 percent 'completely agree'. In OS, 84 percent agree, whereof 36 percent 'completely agree'. According to the surveys, OS participants thus engage somewhat more in buying ecological and local food than their counterparts in BLL. When asked of the extent to which participation in the respective groups has contributed to 'an increased consumption of ecological and local/short-traveled food', the BLL respondents are divided and there is no clear trend in either direction. Participation in the group has influenced some of the participants to choose more sustainable food according to themselves, whereas others state it has not. We find a similar result for OS respondents, although with a slightly stronger degree of positive answers.

The findings are supported by the interviews, where a majority of OS informants point out that they often buy ecological and/or local foods as they see it as "important" (#16) for the environment's sake. Many BLL informants say they do so to some degree, but that they are not coherent in their practice; they do so for some products and not others for example. Barriers for buying more ecological and/or local foods are noted by some of the informants to be availability and price, but also by a few that they sometimes "forget" (#7) to pick the ecological/local option and instead buy out of habit. Concerning their subjective opinion on whether participation in the group has influenced them to buy more ecological or local foods, the informants— like the respondents— are of mixed opinion. Some of the BLL—and some more of the OS informants— do say that they have become more aware of the ecological and/or local alternatives when they go shopping, and that they choose them

more often than before. They are however unsure if this is solely because of their participation in OS or also because of other factors, such as an improved personal economy or that local/ecological food has seemingly become trendier than it used to be. Both factors may serve as rival explanations to why some participants have modified their practices and started buying more ecological or local food. To examine whether it is participation in the TM groups that have influenced participants to adopt the alternative consumption practice, we need to look at how the groups' activities address the practice.

If we split the alternative practice of buying local/ecological food into its different constituting elements, in line with a SPT perspective, we see that the activities of BLL address the three elements to varying degrees. The social component of the alternative practice is addressed through the participants' engagement in a collective, normative understanding within the group that buying local and/or ecological foods is both good for one's health and for the environment and is 'better' than buying imported foods. This notion is repeated in information posted on BLL's Facebook page, in invitations sent out to the group and in activities promoting local and ecological alternatives. Thus participants are from a social norms perspective more likely to change their practice after joining BLL. The competence component of the practice is addressed through the practical courses mentioned above, where participants learn how to identify eatable plants in the nature, cook seasonal food and/or use all parts of local lamb. In these food courses, emphasis is put on the quality of the ingredients, often noting the importance of ecological and local production has on health effects, but also for taste. The courses may serve to modify habitual cooking practices, by introducing new skills and ideas for how to find and cook with seasonal vegetables or local meat. The courses are not held very regularly however, which might be a challenge when it comes to changing cooking practices deeply engrained in habitus—because of their constant reproduction. The courses also do not specifically address the practice

of buying, which can also be characterized as a habitual practice – confer the barrier noted by informants of 'forgetting' to buy local/ecological because they buy what they always have bought. Still, participation in the group can through cooking courses and communal dinners engage the habitus of participants, structuring new dispositions for cooking and buying groceries. The material component of the alternative practice is the least addressed within the group, and also where the largest barriers for increased uptake of the practice lie according to BLL informants, who note price and availability as barriers. This might also help explain why there has not been a greater change in practice within the group; even though participants engage in a social environment where it is the 'right' thing to do, and they also learn skills on how to prepare the food and gain knowledge of why it is important —the fact that it is still more expensive or harder to get hold of local food than to buy imported food serve as a barrier. The new initiative Matkollektivet will be interesting to follow in this regard, as it is an attempt to both increase availability and reduce the price of local foods. In this way, Matkollektivet effectively address the material component of the alternative practice. It remains to be seen whether this will increase the uptake of the alternative practice and consequently contribute to changing the practice of buying imported foods to a greater extent than today. From an SPT perspective this is the missing dimension.

Also the activities of OS only partly address the elements of the alternative practice of buying local/ecological foods. They arguably address the social element of the alternative practice, by emphasizing the importance of buying local and/or ecological foods over imported ones, both in the food courses held, and in participants' conversations around food. Also, a large part of OS participants engage in buying local/ecological, contributing to strengthen the social norms promoting the practice. The competence element is by OS addressed through different cooking courses and courses in identifying eatable plants in the nature, similar to BLL. In addition, the monthly pot lucks

are regular events where participants cook for each other. Many informants explain that these events have turned more vegetarian and ecological. From observation many of the conversation at these monthly gatherings are about food, and about sharing recipes of the different dishes brought and knowledge about the ingredients. Many informants also said that they had started eating less meat as a result of being inspired by what they learnt at food courses or from other participants in the group cooking "amazing" (#13) vegetarian foods for the pot-luck evenings. Despite its contribution to a less energy-intensive diet (Marlow et al 2009), eating less meat is not a practice to be scrutinized in this study, but is mentioned in order to give an example of how the monthly suppers may contribute to modify habitual food practices.

Within OS, the material element of the practice of buying ecological/local is addressed only to a small degree. The event arranged in cooperation with Oslo Kooperativ to promote easier access to food from local producers through their coop was only a one-time event. Compared to BLL, a slightly larger part of OS informants and respondents still say however that they are buying more ecological/local after joining OS. From an SPT perspective, this can be interpreted as a result of the other two elements of the practice being more strongly addressed within OS than within BLL. As a larger share of participants engages in the alternative practice, it can be argued that the social norms promoting it are stronger within OS than within BLL. Also, as the cooking events are held more regularly than within BLL since OS also arranges a monthly café, the competence element in OS is more strongly addressed.

At the same time, we see that information on the benefits of buying ecological and local foods is not enough for making everyone change their practices of buying imported foods. Neither is taking part in a community of strong social norms promoting it, when either habits or material infrastructure (or both) act in favor of keeping the practice as it is.

6.2.2 Growing your own

A larger difference between the two groups can be found in the other alternative food practice to be examined here: Only a minority of the BLL respondents grows its own food, whereas about half of the OS respondents do so to some degree. Likewise, turning to whether participation contributes to participants increasingly growing their own food, the majority of BLL respondents reply negatively (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012). Yet among OS respondents the picture is very different; here a slight majority states that participation has indeed influenced them to grow more of their own food.

These differences found in the surveys are supported by the interviews conducted and the observation made. Whereas growing food is one of the main activities and pillars within OS, it is not as popular within BLL compared to their other activities. BLL has held several courses in 'how to start your own kitchen garden', promoting the growing of vegetables and herbs. The group has also started a small group for people who don't have gardens or who want to grow together with others, managing a certain number of smaller allotment gardens on the grounds of the local church. In addition, a project called 'Food forest' is well underway, where a spot in the forest at Landås is being cleared by BLL participants and eatable plants planted for passersby. There have thus been several activities concerned with growing food. Some of the BLL informants indeed said they have started growing vegetables in their own gardens and found it "meaningful" (#4) and "fun" (#3). Yet, another informant said that "it is probably fun for families with kids, but we don't all have an interest in growing" (#8). Another informant, herself active in the group growing the allotment gardens, noted that many of the participants in the group lead hectic lives and has little time to spend in the allotment gardens (#9). Barriers noted explicitly are thus lack of interest and lack of time.

Lack of time is also mentioned by a few of the OS informants as a barrier. Lack of interest is not however: the group of people who engage in

activities concerning growing of food is the largest one of OS' working groups. According to the initiators, many join OS precisely because they are interested in growing. At the same time, availability and the opportunity to learn from experienced growers are put forward by informants as factors making it easy to take part in growing activities. OS manage several allotments in the school gardens at Sagene, providing the infrastructure needed for growing. For many of the informants the allotments are imperative for facilitating growing of food, as few of them have gardens connected to their house or apartment. Also, the ability to learn from and grow together with others is emphasized by many of the informants.

In BLL, we see that the social norms promoting growing of food are not as strong as within OS. A majority of the BLL respondents answer positively when questioned whether they find it 'meaningful to grow local food'; the number of people who grow their own food is nevertheless small. The social element of the practice is more strongly addressed within OS, where a majority of the participants engage in growing food and where a larger majority say they find it meaningful. As one informant puts it: "Among participants in OS it is kind of cool to be environmentally friendly and this creates a dynamic; it is what gives you status. If you are really good at growing, you are cool (laughter)" (#2). Although BLL has held several activities of learning how to grow, few of the respondents have started growing food. In OS, a majority have started.

From a practice theory perspective, factors that contributes to explain the contrast between the uptake of growing food among OS and BLL participants is that OS to a greater degree addresses the material and social element of the practice. Both groups hold courses addressing the competence element of the practice, but OS manages a larger space for collective growing than BLL (material), and the number of participants and the emphasis on it's meaningfulness has a stronger foothold within the group (social). This also

serves as an interesting parallel to the other alternative food practice studied, that of buying ecological/local food, within OS. For buying local/ecological food, the social and competence elements of the practice are strongly addressed, while the material aspect nearly not at all. From a SPT perspective, we can argue that the reason for the stronger uptake of growing over buying local food within OS is that the material aspect of the former is addressed in a much larger degree.

Also for this practice, rival explanations must be addressed. Many of the informants in both BLL and OS note that they experience a larger international and national trend of urban gardening. They reflect upon that this trend has helped not only normalize the practice, but also been part of the inspiration for why they wanted to start gardening. Still, all informants who talk about this trend also mention that OS and BLL facilitated the realization of their idea. As one OS informant puts it: "We were already interested in gardening, but didn't know so much about it and didn't have a place to grow. OS made it easier to start; we got experienced people to learn from and not at least a place to grow" (#16). Participation in OS or BLL is most likely not the sole reason why more participants initiate the practice of growing, but from these findings it is arguably a contributing factor.

The extent to which the growing activity of the groups can challenge the current practice of buying imported foods is a relevant question. None of the participants grow food to an extent that they can be self-sufficient by any means. The other alternative practice, that of buying local foods, is to a larger degree directly competing with the current practice of buying imported foods, as it has the potential to challenge the habitual practices of how and where participants shop for food (as an example, whether to pick the local alternative or not in the shop). When it comes to growing their own food it is arguably an alternative practice that can help reduce the extent and thus energy use of the current practice of imported foods, but it is also arguably a practice that is

viewed among participants more as a hobby than as a real alternative to buying food in the shops. From an SPT perspective, this can also help explain why the uptake of the practice of growing is larger than that of buying local food within the OS; it doesn't directly compete with the habitual practice of buying imported foods. Still, such alternative practices as growing food must necessarily start small, and it remains to be seen to what extent it will challenge the practice of buying food as times go along.

6.3 Transport

As explained in more details in chapter 2.2.2, this study will also examine two alternative consumption practices that have the potential to challenge or change the practice of using cars for means of transport and thus reduce the energy use embedded in transportation practices. The practice of using the car is a combination of a normative context where this is viewed as unproblematic, 'normal' and/or of status, an embedded and cognitive knowledge of how to drive and move around, plus the material infrastructure of roads, prices, distance to facilities, amongst others. The first alternative practice to be studied here is to use a bicycle instead of a personal car. The second is to use collective transportation like public transportation or car sharing instead of a personal car.

6.3.1 Using the bicycle

Both BLL and OS hold regularly bicycle repair workshops, where participants repair and fix their bicycles together, with the help of someone who has a certain degree of experience with bicycle repairs. This is the only regular bicycle-related activity within both groups. The practice of regularly using bicycle for going to and from work is among BLL respondents relatively evenly spread out between those who say they do so often or to some degree, and those who say they do so in little degree or just do not (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012). The same result is pretty much the case for the question on

regular use of bicycle in the spare time, although here we see a slight majority of respondents stating more use. These findings are supported by informants, creating an overall picture of BLL participants' use of bicycles to be that half of them regularly use bicycle as means of transportation to and from work, and some more of them use the bicycle in their spare time. On the question of whether participation in BLL has contributed to more use of bicycle, a majority of the respondents answer negatively (ibid). Among OS respondents, a stronger majority state that they use the bicycle to and from work, although well above a third of the respondents say they do so to a little degree or do not. A remarkably larger majority, however, states that they use their bicycle in their spare time. These findings are supported by the informants. Yet also here a minority of respondents attributes OS a lot of influence when it comes to increasing their bicycling, although the share of the ones who do is somewhat larger compared to BLL. Even though participants in OS seem to engage in the practice of bicycling more than participants in BLL, this is thus not necessarily because of their involvement with OS.

However, the relatively large number of people bicycling within the groups does necessarily strengthen the social norm of doing so, as it becomes normal and respected. Although a minority, a number of the respondents did mention that participation in the group had influenced them to bicycle more. This is supported by the informants. As an example, one BLL informant said that her husband had started bicycling "a lot more" after they moved to Landås (#7). Her explanation: "It has something to do with the people living there, the enthusiasm. Suddenly you see your neighbor happily biking with an electrical bicycle, I think he borrowed it from BLL, that kind of thing (laughter)" (#7). She added that "it's not like we're planning to sell our car or anything, but we use it a bit less than before". Another BLL informant told about her ongoing process of going from her current practice of using the car to and from work, to the alternative practice of using the bicycle. The family has two cars and

they were planning on getting rid of one of them, as they saw it as "unnecessary" (#4) to have two, due to environmental reasons, but also in order to save money. With her bicycle she uses more time on transport than she was with her car, but she rationalized the time use by saying that "you get some fresh air and a nice workout" (#4). She was contemplating testing an electrical bicycle, mentioning that others in the neighborhood had one. One OS informant also noted she "was motivated" (#14) to bicycle more, seeing so many of the others in the group was biking to and from activities. From an SPT perspective we see that social norms, what is deemed as normal and of status within the group, arguably influence the participants in their practice of bicycling within both groups.

When it comes to the competence element of the practice, the courses in fixing and maintaining your bicycle also seem to have some influence. One OS informant said she had "started biking more" after she learned from OS courses how to repair and work with her bicycle (#13). One BLL informant said that she was intrigued by learning how to mend her bicycle in order to make it last longer, noting a "paradoxical and unfortunate situation" (#8) of it often being cheaper to buy a completely new bicycle instead of fixing your own at a mechanics. Combining these factors of strong social norms and of participatory learning, we see that the neighborhood in BLL's case, and the group itself in OS' case, to a certain degree create what Kennedy (2001) in chapter 4.1.3 called "virtuous circles" of promoting the use of bicycle. The groups act as communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991), where mobility practices are reframed and alternative practices learned. The question thus becomes why not a larger share of the participants states that they have increased their bicycling.

Again, we see that the material element of the practice is noted as the largest barrier. Some of the informants in both groups mentioned the poor condition of cycling roads as a barrier. One BLL informant explained her use

of car to and from work with the necessity of bringing kids to and from the kindergarden, which was located in another part of the city, resonating with barriers for organizing everyday life without a car as mentioned in chapter 2.2.2. Through interviews and observation we also understand that one factor explaining why OS participants seem to use their bicycle more is that many of the active participants within OS do not have a car, in contrast to many participants within BLL – again a material factor. This can be seen in relation with a majority of BLL participants being older, with generally higher household income and more children, in Norway often correlating with having a car. It should also be seen in relation to geographical location; whereas Sagene is located in inner Oslo, with a highly developed network of public transportation and short distance to facilities, Landås is located some kilometers outside the city center of Bergen. For example, one OS informant explained her use of bicycle with stating that she did not see the point of having a car when she lives in the middle of the city (this participant did not have children).

Thus, as for the former alternative practices examined, also for the alternative practice of bicycling we see that even though the social and competence elements of the practice is addressed, the barriers noted for an increased uptake are largely material. Material factors such as the conditions and availability of cycle roads and infrastructure, or availability of facilities in short distance from the local community, are arguably hard to change for a community group without involving the local government.

6.3.2 Collective transportation

When it comes to promoting forms for collective transportation, OS do not arrange any regular activities addressing the issue. BLL does neither arrange any regular activities, but they have started cooperation with the car sharing collective Carma Bergen, which connects people who wants to do car sharing

within Bergen. BLL has created their own group within Carma Bergen to promote the service and facilitate connection between interested BLL participants. BLL has also sent one consultative document to the local administration in a public hearing concerning the routes of public transport in Bergen. The letter proposed changes in the current routes of public transportation, in order to increase the usefulness for the inhabitants at Landås. No changes have as of yet happened in the routes, but it is included here to describe a form of engagement with the material elements of a practice that might yield results in the future.

Questioned whether they regularly use car as way of transportation for short distances, the majority of BLL respondents reply negatively. Asked whether they use public transportation 'if possible', a majority of the respondents answer positively. The same is the result for the OS respondents; the majorities are however noticeable larger in both, indicating that OS participants use cars less and public transport more. Still, also here we see that when asked whether participation in the respective groups has contributed to a more 'environmentally friendly transportation', the respondents grant their respective groups fairly little influence. A majority of BLL respondents answer that their participation has not contributed to more environmentally friendly transport use or done so in little degree, while a third says that it has done so to a certain. Within OS, the majority also replies negatively, and the share that replies positively is a bit smaller than for BLL.

Due to the factors mentioned in the previous section—that many OS participants do not own a car and live in an area with a developed public transport system—it is not surprising that many OS respondents state that they engage in the practice of using public transportation. Seeing as increasing the use of public transportation has neither been prioritized in the activities of OS, nor an explicit goal for the group, it should not be expected that participation in the group has had influence on the uptake of this alternative practice. While

the social norms supporting the alternative practice might be strong within the group, in the sense that few participants drive a car and there are strong social norms for using alternative transportation to a car in place, neither the competence element nor the material element of the alternative practice is addressed.

In contrast, participation in BLL has made a somewhat stronger influence on transport practices. From a SPT perspective, this can be seen in relation to BLLs facilitation of car sharing, through their cooperation with Carma Bergen, which addresses all three elements of the practice of sharing your car with others. Through promoting car sharing, the group may influence social norms and contribute to the perception of car sharing as something normal and positive. Through engaging participants in the practice of car sharing, the group may promote learning by doing. The group also addresses the material element to a certain extent, by facilitating participation in the car sharing network. Important to note is that the cooperation between Carma Bergen and BLL is fairly new and it will thus be difficult to measure its effects. A majority of the respondents say that their participation in BLL has not influenced them to do more of car sharing for work or spare time activities, but a few respondents say that it has (Haukeland and Brandtzæg 2012). BLLs involvement in the hearing process of public transportation routes in Bergen is another sign of their increasing engagement in material aspects of the practices they seek to change, but the potential effect of this measure is outside the scope of this study.

Compared to the groups' involvement in the alternative practice of bicycling, their involvement in the practice of collective transportation is small. However, there is great potential in creating viscous circles also for this practice: A large number of the participants in both groups already engage in the alternative practice of public transportation and the social norms promoting it are strong within both BLL and OS. From a SPT perspective, what is lacking

is engaging participants through participatory learning, and to address the material barriers of the practice. The latter is however difficult to do without involving the local government. The practice of car sharing holds promise within BLL, although it is still a little early to measure its results.

6.4 Clothing

When it comes to reducing general consumption, both OS and BLL have focused many of their activities on clothing. This is a relatively broad category from their perspective, including clothes, shoes and accessories. As explained in more details in chapter 2.2.3, this study will examine two alternative consumption practices promoted by the TM groups that have the potential to challenge or change the practice of buying new, imported clothing. Buying new clothing is from a SPT perspective a combination of social and cultural norms where this is viewed as unproblematic, 'normal' and/or of status, an embedded and cognitive knowledge of how to shop (and lack of knowledge on how to repair), plus the material infrastructure of shops, prices and commercials amongst others. The first alternative practice to be studied is to either buy or exchange *used* clothing, or to borrow clothing from others, instead of buying new or throwing old away. The second is to repair or reuse your old clothing.

6.4.1 Exchanging, borrowing or buying second-hand

Both groups arrange what OS calls "exchange market" and BLL calls "exchange party"; places where people bring something used that they don't want or need, and exchange it with something they want or need more, that someone else brought. In addition to clothing, at these markets people can also bring and exchange household appliances, kitchenware, sports equipment, books, toys etc.

Concerning buying second-hand products, more of OS than BLL respondents state that they 'buy used rather than new': for OS the result is a

clear majority, for BLL the result is approximately half-and-half. Concerning sharing or exchanging clothing, a majority of BLL respondents answer positively on whether participation has led them to become more prone for giving away stuff they don't need any longer, instead of throwing it away. Also within OS a majority answer positively, however a larger share than within BLL answer negatively.

Hence, there are signs of participation influencing the uptake of the alternative practice of exchanging/buying used/borrowing clothing in both groups. This finding is supported by the informants. The social norms promoting exchanging and borrowing seem to be strong in both groups: Many of the informants within both BLL and OS say that they appreciate being part of groups where it is judged positively to inherit and exchange clothes. Many of the informants also note a larger societal trend of second hand and re-use. One BLL informant, who moved to Landås three years back, puts it like this:

> Using other people's clothes, it hasn't been viewed very positively. But now I feel like the trend is shifting. But I also think that especially at Landås it is totally okay to wear someone else's football shoes for example. I think it has to do with the people living there, it is completely normal to inherit shoes when someone has grown out of them. I think it is great; it contributes to reducing the amount we buy because we can just exchange between us. It wasn't like this where we used to live before (#7).

The quote may serve as an example of how the participants are influenced by the social norms that apply to their acts. A greater societal trend of valuing re-use and re-cycling may serve as a rival explanation to why BLL and OS participants engage with these practices. At the same time, the two groups' strong valuation of exchanging, borrowing and buying second-hand plays a role in both facilitating and strengthening those practices. Thus from an SPT perspective the social element of the alternative practice of buying or exchanging used clothing, or borrowing clothing from someone else, is addressed within both groups.

The competence element is to a certain degree addressed by the exchange markets, where participants learn how to "shop" for the clothes of others, and give away one's own. However, some of the informants in both groups point to a tendency of some people participating at the exchange markets bringing clothing that are of bad quality and not likely to be exchanged. As one of the informants puts it: "Some people use the market to get rid of stuff that's worn down or doesn't work, using it as a place of disposal" (#7). The activity may thereby not have the wanted effect of reduced consumption of new products, and it may even have a negative effect if it leads to participants buying more new products because they got rid of their old ones. However, there are no signs among informants that they use the exchange markets for this purpose and it is difficult to measure the extent to which this may be happening. From observation at some of the OS' exchange markets, some clothing and other products remain without new owners after the market is finished. The OS gathers them and gives the clothing to voluntary organizations that run second hand-stores like UFF or The Salvation Army and the other products they deliver at the local recycling station. According to BLL informants, the same phenomenon and procedure is the case for their events.

Questioned whether participation in BLL or OS has contributed to respondents becoming more positive towards sharing things in local networks, a great majority within both groups answer positively. Note that this question only concern the attitude of the person, not whether this potential change of attitude reflects an actual change of practice (or vice-versa). Both BLL and OS have started online sharing networks where participants can register. At BLL's www.sirkle.no, participants note down what equipment they have to offer/for loan to neighbors and can search for equipment that they need to borrow from someone else. As one of the initiators explain it: "Not everyone *has* to own a drill, a lawn mower or a wheel barrow, especially as we use them so rarely. It

is much more resource effective to facilitate borrowing and exchanging between households" (#1). OS's www.lets.no is a similar concept, but instead of offering objects, one offers a service. The service can be lending out an object, but it can also be yourself and a skill you have. Both the exchange markets and the sharing networks are arenas facilitating the practice of exchanging used clothing or borrowing from others, and thus address the material element of the practice.

Barriers noted among participants in both groups are few, but one notion is mentioned by some of the informants: The desire of something 'new'. As one informant puts it: "Sometimes I too want to buy some new clothes and just feel good about myself wearing it" (#13). Although participating in groups where social norms promoting reuse and borrowing are strong, the practice of buying new clothing seem to be deeply rooted in culture. According to Wilhite et al (2001), practices that are deeply rooted in culture can be difficult to change and demands longer time. We see that the activities of both groups address all three elements of the alternative practice of buying used/exchanging/borrowing clothes, although to a varying degree. A slight majority of participants then also seem to have increased their uptake of the practice. Still, there are some cultural barriers impeding the diffusion of the alternative practice, indicating that it will take longer time for this practice to root.

6.4.2 Repairing or reuse

Both BLL and OS have arranged sewing, repair and/or reuse courses for clothing. A great majority of both BLL and OS respondents state that they do 'recycling and re-use'. Whether participation in the respective groups has contributed to respondents 'doing more of recycling and reuse' is again depending on who you ask; roughly half of the respondents say it has to some degree, the other half say it has to small degree. This is true for both groups,

although OS has a larger share of respondents replying ‘I don’t know’. A slight majority of BLL respondents states that their participation has contributed to in some degree ‘more repairing instead of throwing away’. For OS, the result is more towards half-and-half; with a relatively large group also here uncertain of the influence (replying ‘I don’t know’).

Hence participation in BLL seems to have had a slight larger influence on the uptake of repairing/reusing than what participation in OS. A correlation worth mentioning here is that BLL has arranged more repair courses than OS. From a SPT perspective, these courses address the competence element of the practice; learning how to repair and sew clothes for yourself. Compared to OS, the activities of BLL to a greater extent address this element of the practice. Both groups can arguably be said to address the social element of the practice to a certain degree as well: as a great majority of participants engage in the practice already, it is likely to be seen as both normal and respected. A majority of informants in both groups noted that they saw it as a positive thing to do, but that they had been more interested in other activities.

Consequently, few of the informants in either group have engaged very much in the activities of repairing clothes, and so my data collection for this practice is smaller than for the others. One explicit barrier noted by one BLL informant was that of price; noting that buying new clothes was so cheap that there was little economic incentive in repairing old ones. The fact that it is so cheap to buy new, imported clothes—reducing the incentive to repair old ones — is not something a community group can change by their own. Although based on minimal data, this last finding indicates that it again is the material element of the alternative practice that is impeding its larger uptake. It is also the least addressed by the groups’ activities.

6.5 Summary

From an SPT perspective, changing practices can be done by introducing more low-carbon technologies or objects into the practices (addressing the material), integrating into the practices new norms and ideas promoting sustainability (addressing the social), and/or exposing individuals to learning (addressing the knowledge and competences of the individual). We see that many of the activities of OS and BLL are characterized by learning of new practices by doing, and by creating a social network around these new practices. Fewer of the activities address material and infrastructural aspects of the practices as of today. This is perhaps not surprising as the groups are still in an early phase and we see that especially BLL is increasingly starting to address the material elements of some of the practices. This will be important if the aim is to create change, as we see that the current lack of it affects the ability of the groups to change the practices the participants engage in.

We see that all the six alternative practices studied in this chapter are relatively popular within both groups. Overall, the participants in OS engage somewhat more in the alternative practices than the participants in BLL. Participation in OS has also had a greater influence on the increased uptake of the alternative practices of especially growing food, but also a somewhat larger influence than participation in BLL on the uptake of the practices of buying ecological/local and using the bicycle. Participation in BLL has led to a slight greater uptake of the practices of collective transport and repairing clothes compared to participation in OS. The uptake of exchanging/buying old clothing is similar between the two.

Findings from the former chapter show that OS participants to a greater extent identify themselves as environmentally conscious and as motivated to participate in the group primarily because of environmental concerns. This correlates with findings that the social norms of engaging in the alternative

practices are the most strong within the OS. Where the group arranges activities that teach participants new cognitive or practical skills to facilitate and enable the alternative practices, we see that the uptake of the practice increases. The one practice where OS also largely address its material aspects, that of growing food, the uptake is very high among participants. These findings correlate with what Sahakian and Wilhite (2014) argued in chapter 4.1.3; that the ability to change practices depends on how strongly the different elements of a practice are addressed. Concerning the alternative practices where the uptake is lower within OS, barriers noted by informants to a large degree concern material aspects of the practice.

We see the same mechanisms for the activities of BLL. The social norms promoting the alternative practices are in many cases not as strong as within OS, a factor that reflects findings from the former chapter of less environmentally conscious participants, again reflected in a somewhat smaller uptake of the alternative practices within the group. However, BLL has to a greater extent than OS started to address the material elements of some of the alternative practices. This should be seen in correlation with the group's stricter rules of what an activity should do: assuring that the activities contribute to reducing the ecological footprint of the community, and not solely is arranged for social gains.

Important to note is that, although varying degrees of increased uptake, none of the alternative practices studied have held status quo or decreased in uptake from participation in either group. Many informants from both OS and BLL rather emphasize how participation in the groups has helped remind them of the importance of keeping their already environmentally friendly practices intact, and gave them a different set of comparison for their actions than what the larger society presented. One BLL informant put it like this:

> All these things we buy, and how quickly you are dragged along into it; it is nice to have some counter forces that remind you that you do have a choice, that you don't have to be dragged along into it (#8).

Similarly, an OS informant said that the group helped him act more in line with his environmental values in his everyday life:

> Maybe because the group exists, I can hold on to these values a lot easier. (..) All the time you're just being bombarded by mainstream; what you should listen to, what you should buy, what you should look like, where you should travel, what you should eat. (..) I can imagine I would lapse more easily into that if I didn't have the group to remind me of my values (#12).

We have also seen that participants note that the groups have made it easier for them to initiate the alternative practices, by offering activities or places to perform them and a community of people to perform them with. Although several rival explanations noted above have potentially contributed to the uptake of the alternative practices, the contribution of the two TM groups should thus not be underestimated.

This latter notion also has theoretical relevance. By combining insights from social movement theory with those of social practice theory, I have in this thesis attempted to extend theoretical formulations of how practices spread or can be made to spread. In the former two chapters of analysis, I have shown that alternative practices spread through processes of social and participatory learning within the TM groups, which act as communities of practice. The TM facilitates this learning by creating alternative places for it to happen, where mainstream norms and practices are challenged and to varying degree changed through collectively innovating alternative practices. Social movements, with their aim for cultural transformation, may thus give valuable insights into how mainstream practices are changed and alternative practices are spread.

Accumulating findings further, we see that the two different TM groups serve slightly different functions: BLL has grown out from—and to a certain degree transformed—a neighborhood, including less environmentally conscious people, changing their practices in a more environmentally friendly direction. OS has gathered already environmentally conscious people from all

over a city and helped them strengthen each other's practices to create an even larger change. Both developments are important from an environmental perspective. The TM groups are effectively addressing other aspects of energy-related consumption than contemporary consumption- and energy efficiency policies have addressed. Instead of emphasizing merely information or pleading to participants' morality, the groups' activities engage participants in processes of participatory learning and thus act as Lave and Wenger's (1991) notion of 'communities of practice'. In this way they also play the role of 'enthusiasts' described by Karlstrøm et al (2013), in engaging citizens in energy use reduction through just doing it and learning others how to do it.

The Transition groups thus seem to represent a novel way of socially organizing in the face of environmental change in a Norwegian context. Their emphasis on specific and practical action alternatives connected to everyday life in the local community differs from the more state-centric politics of the more established environmental movement, emphasizing methods of advocacy and information campaigns. The TM also seems to enact a broader motivational framing for mobilization purposes, engaging people as much on issues of quality of life, sense of community in the neighborhood and doing something joyful and practical—as on environmental concerns. I will argue that this is where some of the potential of TM seems to lie in a Norwegian context. Norwegian consumption and energy saving policies have been criticized for focusing too much on economic motives of saving money and too little on social, material and cultural aspects of behavior (see chapter 2). The TM groups counter this. The Norwegian environmental movement has been criticized for being narrow, moralistic and academic, and for having little relevance for people's everyday lives (see chapter 2). The TM groups counter this as well.

The challenge of both groups however, if they were to create an even larger change, is dual. One is to reach out to a broader segment of the public

than at present. Although succeeding in mobilizing people without earlier experience from environmental or volunteer work, the groups are still largely composed of the highly educated middle class. The other is that although succeeding in addressing social and competence aspects of energy-related consumption, the groups to a lesser degree address the material and infrastructural aspects. This chapter has shown that the groups do create change by supporting and teaching each other how to act to reduce the energy use and carbon emissions of their everyday life, but as of today only to a certain point. Barriers noted by participants in this chapter show that material and infrastructural aspects of the alternative practices still limits their uptake. If these barriers are not addressed, the practice will likely remain at its present level.

7. Concluding remarks

In this thesis I have examined the mechanisms through which the two biggest Transition groups in Norway have formed, how they have mobilized participants, and whether and how participation in the groups has contributed to an increased uptake of alternative and less energy-intensive social practices regarding consumption of food, transport and clothing. I have also discussed questions of why, or why not, the groups have succeeded in mobilizing participants and/or in changing participants' consumption practices. Applying social practice theory and social movement theory, I have analysed findings for each of the two groups exclusively, as well as across both cases. Such a comparison has enabled insight into not only the formation and the results of the Transition Movement in Norway in general, but also into local variations and the factors explaining these variations.

In answering the first research question, I have shown how BLL has grown out of, and is deeply anchored in, its local context and demography, whereas OS has grown out from likeminded individuals seeking together over common interests. Put succinctly: Whereas BLL is growing out of and transforming an existing community, OS is creating a new community. I have further shown how the groups have formed similar collective identities, in that both groups distinguish themselves from the more established environmental organizations. However, the two groups differ somewhat in their interests and concerns—and thus also in identity. Participants in both groups place a particular importance on the social aspects of participation. Yet whereas BLL participants are mainly motivated by creating a tighter social network in the neighborhood, OS participants are mainly motivated by environmental concerns and creating a social network around them. Still, both groups share a broad motivational framing that does not include only environmental or local gains, but also social and personal gains for the participants. This has also led

to the groups' success in mobilizing people with little experience or history in engaging in political or organizational life.

For the second research question, I have shown how participation in the groups varying degrees address the constituting elements of six alternative consumption practices that are less energy-intensive than mainstream practices. Participation has in many cases led to an increased uptake of the alternative practices within both groups, mainly through strengthening social norms promoting the practices and facilitating learning through social participation. The groups largely succeed in addressing the social element of the practices, and to an almost as great extent the competence element; however the activities to a lesser extent address the material element of the practices. I have shown that the more that the activities of the groups address all three elements of the practice, the more participants engage in it. Barriers noted among participants for increasingly engaging in the alternative practices are then also mainly of the material kind. These are barriers that the TM groups cannot remove by their own.

Combining these findings with insights from social practice theory and social movement theory, I have argued that social movement theory can extend theoretical formulations of how social practices spread or can be made to spread. Just as Nick Crossley (2002) has outlined how SPT can inform SMT, I will thus argue that the favor can also be returned. I have shown that alternative practices spread through processes of social and participatory learning within TM groups, which act as communities of practice. The TM facilitates this learning by creating alternative places for it to happen; for collectively inventing and enacting alternative consumption practices and norms. These places turn questions of everyday consumption, by mainstream society largely viewed as private actions, into collective actions enacted in the public sphere.

In this way, the work of TM is also political. Through learning from and engaging each other, the groups are demonstrating an original way of engaging citizens in reducing the energy intensity of their consumption. In many ways it is the opposite of what energy efficiency and consumption policies have prescribed the latter years. Instead of trying to persuade with information and plead to the individual's morality, the groups engage their participants through offering specific action alternatives that are both perceived as fun, social and convenient. As importantly, they generate a sense of meaning for participants through framing the participants as part of the solution. The TM groups thus translate troublesome information of over-consumption and climate change into specific, local action alternatives, where participants are framed as the solution—not simply the problem. The results are communities that strengthen the engagement of individuals in less energy intensive practices, and to various degrees also increase the uptake of some of these practices.

However, I have also argued that there are limitations to the potential effect of the TM groups' approaches. They have to a limited extent reached out to segments of society other than the highly educated middle class. Also, material infrastructure serves as a barrier for further spreading the less energy-intensive practices. As community groups excluded from positions of economic and formal political power the TM groups can to a limited extent reduce these barriers themselves. Put bluntly: To promote bicycling, it definitely helps that the groups create communities where bicycling is deemed as a better as well as a normal alternative to the car, and that they arrange activities where participants learn how to maintain and engage with their bicycles. However, these two notions are not likely to alone influence the infrastructure of bicycle roads in Bergen and Oslo—that keep some participants from bicycling. This fact resonates with the critique of the TM as naïve and incapable of changing large and complex systems referred to earlier in this thesis.

Still, the groups are in an early phase and it remains to be seen how they develop. I will rather argue that ignoring these groups, who are successfully engaging citizens in reducing the energy load of everyday practices, would be unwise. In a country like Norway, where a unanimous political goal is to increase energy savings and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and where the number of participants in the established environmental movement has been decreasing, scholars and policymakers should perhaps devote more attention to the TM groups' approaches.

7.1 Prospects for further research

In light of its potential to engage citizens in difficult questions of our time, it seems strange how little the TM has been object of study in Norway. Throughout the research process I have come across several aspects of the movement that I will argue needs further attention by scholars:

This thesis has shown that the TM groups are deeply influenced by their different local contexts, both in how they are formed, organized and in which issues they deem important. As mentioned in chapter 6.1, the TM groups studied are also in limited contact with the larger Transition Network. This warrants a closer examination of the relationship between the TM at a central and local levels, and what potentially vast local difference means for the central vision and measures of success for the TM as a whole.

In chapter 2.1, I mention that few TM initiatives have formed in Norway so far, compared to neighboring countries. In a Norwegian context, the seemingly apolitical stance of the movement has an additional dimension that may help us understand the reasons for this. Bortne et al (2001:19-22) argue that a special feature of the Norwegian environmental movement and organization is that it has developed in an increasingly close relationship to the State, as the State has crept into areas formerly the arena of the civil society. This development is rooted in a high level of trust in the State and public

institutions in the Norwegian public, but it is also a reciprocal relationship, where the environmental movement has had a great deal of influence on governmental policies. The government also supports the organisations both financially and with legitimacy. Other scholars (Dryzek et al 2003) have noted how grassroots initiatives in Norway tend to get quickly institutionalized or co-opted by the State. Thus, Bortne et al (2011) argue that there is little room for an organization or movement that wishes to pose an alternative to the State in the Norwegian society. This warrants a closer look at how the TM relates to the State in a Norwegian context.

Related to this, I have also touched upon the difference between the TM and the more established environmental movement. This thesis has shown that the TM in Norway to a large degree mobilizes people who have not been active in the environmental movement earlier and who moreover do not identify themselves with the environmental movement or its participants. A more thorough comparison between the TM and the different environmental organisations could help shed light on whether and why there is a large difference between the people who engage in the TM and those who engage in the more established environmental movement. Such a study could also inform both movements of how to reach out to a larger part of the population.

The fact that the TM groups manage to mobilize people who do not identify with the environmental movement, and moreover do not identify themselves as environmentally conscious, should also be further explored. The examination of motivations in this thesis tell of participants concerned with solidarity and the environment, but also of motives of pleasure, convenience and increasing one's social network. These findings challenge the validity of theoretical frameworks that asserts that people are more likely to act in an environmentally friendly way if they have strong pro-environmentally values, as some scholars argue (Crompton and Kasser 2009). In contrast, the findings of this thesis suggest that people can come to act in an environmentally

friendly way without such values in place. This question however needs further probing, both empirically and theoretically. The theories applied in this thesis have proved useful for understanding how the TM form and mobilize participants, and how the TM work to change energy-related practices, but they have not enabled a thorough discussion on this issue.

List of references

Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E. and A. Escobar (1998): ”Introduction: The cultural and the political in Latin American social movements” in Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E. and A. Escobar (eds): *Culture of politics, politics of cultures. Re-visioning Latin American social movements*. Colorado: Westview press.

Attali, S. and H. Wilhite (2001): “Assessing variables supporting and impeding the development of car sharing” in *Proceedings of the ECEEE 2001 Summer Study*. Paris: European Council for an Energy Efficient Econmy.

Baer, P., Fieldman, G., Athanasiou, T. and S. Kartha (2012): “Greenhouse Development Rights: towards an equitable framework for global climate policy" in Harris, P. (ed): *The Politics of Climate Change: Environmental Dynamics in International Affairs.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Bang-Andersen, S. (2013): «Omstilling til en bærekraftig samfunnsutvikling. En case studie av Transition Towns og Cittaslow i Norge». [MBA dissertation, Bodø Graduate School of Business, University of Nordland] [online] -URL: http://issuu.com/s-ba/docs/omstilling (Retrieved 20.06.2014).

Bate, P., Bevan, H. and G. Robert (2005): “Towards a million change agents. A review of the social movement literature: Implications for large scale change in the NHS”. Report. NHS Modernisation Agency.

Benford, R. and D. Snow (2000): “Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment.” *Annual review of sociology* 26: 661-639.

Bergen Kommune (2011): “Levekår og helse i Bergen.” Report. Bergen: Bergen kommune. [online] -URL: https://www.bergen.kommune.no/bk/multimedia/archive/00138/LEVEK_RS RAPPORT_LO_138987a.pdf (Retrieved 13.09.2014).

Blee, K. and V. Taylor (2002): “Semi-structured interviewing in social movement research” in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bortne, Ø., Grendstad, G., Selle, P. and K. Strømsnes (2001): *Norsk miljøvernorganisering mellom stat og samfunn.* Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget

Bourdieu, P. (1977): *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990): *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998): *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. California: Stanford University Press.

Boykoff, M., Goodman, M. and I. Curtis (2010): "Costly Knowledge – Unaffordable Denial: The politics of public understanding and engagement on climate change" in Boykoff, M. (ed): *The Politics of Climate Change.* New York: Routledge

Brown, J. and M. Purcell (2005): "There's nothing inherent about scale: Political ecology, the local trap and the politics of development in the Brazilian Amazon" *Geoforum* 36(5): 607-624.

Brønnøysundregistrene (2013a): "Omstilling Sagene" [online]. –URL: http://w2.brreg.no/enhet/sok/detalj.jsp?orgnr=999528481 (Retrieved 10.03.2014)

Brønnøysundregistrene (2013b): "Bærekraftige liv på Landås" [online]. –URL: http://w2.brreg.no/enhet/sok/detalj.jsp?orgnr=812645692 (Retrieved 10.03.2014)

Bulkeley, H. and K. Kern (2006): "Local Government and the Governing of Climate Change in Germany and the UK". *Urban Studies* 43(12): 2237– 2259.

Campbell, C. (1995): "The sociology of consumption" in Miller, D. (ed): *Acknowledging consumption. A review of new studies*. London: Routledge.

Carter, N. (2007): "Sustainable development and ecological modernisation" in *The politics of the environment. Ideas, activism and policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press

Cresswell, J. (1998): *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five traditions*. California: Sage Publications Ltd.

Cresswell, T. (2004): *Place. A short introduction.* Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Crompton, T. and T. Kasser (2009): "Meeting Environmental Challenges: The Role of Human Identity" Surrey: WWF-UK.

Crossley, N. (2002): *Making sense of social movements.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Crossley, N. (2013): "Habit and Habitus". *Body & Society* 19(2-3): 136-161.

DN (2014): "Årsrapport 2013. Danmarks Naturfredningsforening". København: Danmarks Naturfredningsforening [online]. –URL: file:///C:/Users/ins/Downloads/%C3%85rsrapport13_regnskab_WEB.pdf (Retrieved 05.11.2014).

Dryzek, J., Downes, D., Hunold C., and D. Schlosberg (2003): *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in |the U.S., U.K., Germany and Norway*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EEA (2012): "*Consumption and the Environment - 2012 Update. The European Environment. State and Outlook 2010."* Copenhagen: European Environment Agency. [online]. –URL: http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/consumption-and-the-environment-2012 (Retrieved 16.10.2014).

Felicetti, A. (2013): "Localism and the Transition movement" *Policy Studies* 34(5-6): 559-574.

Fine, G. (1995): "Public narration and group culture: Discerning discourse in social movements" in Johnston, H. and B. Klandermans (eds): *Social Movements and Culture.* London: UCL Press.

FIVH (2014): "Årsmelding 2013" Oslo: Framtiden i våre hender. [online]. –URL: http://www.framtiden.no/om-oss/arsmelding/ (Retrieved 05.11.2014).

Foxon, T (2011): "Governing a low carbon energy transition: lessons from UK and Dutch approaches" in Galarraga, I., Gonzalez-Eguino, M. and A. Markandya (eds): *Handbook of sustainable energy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Giddens, A. (1984): *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Habermas, J. (1987): *The theory of communicative action: System and lifeworld*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Halkier, B (2013): "Sustainable lifestyles in a new economy: a practice theoretical perspective on change behavior campaigns and sustainability issues" in Cohen, M., Brown, H. and P. Vergrargt (eds): *Innovations in sustainable consumption. New economics, socio-technical transitions and social practices.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing limited.

Hardt, E. (2013): "In transition: The politics of place-based prefigurative social movements" [MBA dissertation, University of Massachutes-Amherst]. *Open Acess Dissertations*. Paper 744.

Hargreaves, T. (2011): "Practice-ing behavior change: Applying social practice theory to pro-environmental behaviour change". *Journal of Consumer Culture* 11(1): 79-99.

Hargreaves, T., Haxeltine, A., Longhurst, N. and G. Seyfang (2011): "Sustainability transitions from the bottom-up: Civil society, the multi-level perspective and

practice theory". CSERGE Working Paper 2011/01. Norwich: The Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, University of East Anglia.

Hargreaves, T., Longhurst, N. and G. Seyfang (2013): "Up, down, round and round: connecting regimes and practices in innovation for sustainability". *Environment and Planning.* 45(2): 402-420.

Haukeland, P. and B. Brandtzæg (2012): "Bærekraftige liv på Landås. Resultater fra en spørreundersøkelse". Notat. Bø: Telemarksforskning.

Hielscher, S., Seyfang G. and A. Smith (2011): "Community innovation for sustainable energy". CSERGE Working Paper 2011/03. Norwich: The Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, University of East Anglia.

Hille, J. (2012): "Norsk forbruk i miljøperspektiv. Om forbruksnivå, trender, miljøbelastning og økonomiske virkemidler for å vri forbruket i grønnere retning. 2011." Rapport 3/2012. Oslo: Framtiden i våre hender.

Hille, J., Storm, H., Aall, C. and H. Sataøen (2008): "Miljøbelastningen fra norsk forbruk og norsk produksjon 1987-2007. En analyse i forbindelse med 20-årsjubileet for utgivelse av rapporten "Vår Felles Framtid"". Vestlandsforskningsrapport 2/2008. Sogndal: Vestlandsforskning.

Hernes, G. (2012): *Hot topic – cold comfort. Climate change and attitude change.* Oslo: Nordforsk.

Hopkins, R. (2013): *The power of just doing stuff. How local action can change the world.* Cambridge: Green Books

IEA (2009): "World energy outlook". Paris: OECD/IEA. [online]. –URL: http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/media/weowebsite/2009/WEO2009.pdf (Retrieved 02.04.2014)

IEA (2011): "Energy policies of IEA countries. Norway. 2011 Review." Paris: OECD/IEA. [online]. –URL: http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/norway2011_web.pdf (Retrieved 02.10.2014).

IEA (2013): "Redrawing the energy-climate gap. World energy outlook special report". Paris: OECD/IEA. [online]. –URL: http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/WEO_Special_Report_2013_Redrawing_the_Energy_Climate_Map.pdf (Retrieved 02.04.2014).

IPPC (2007): *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Contribution of*

Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis M., Averyt, K., Tignor, M. and H.Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IPCC (2013): *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G., Tignor, M., Allen, S., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V. and P. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, H. and B. Klandermans (1995): "The cultural analysis of social movements" in Johnston, H. and B. Klandermans (eds): *Social Movements and Culture.* London: UCL Press.

Johnston, H. (2002): "Verification and proof in frame and discourse analysis" in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Laitala, K. and I. Klepp (2014): "Arv og deling av klær, sko og sportsutstyr" in Lavik, R. and E. Borgeraas (eds): "Forbrukstrender 2014. SIFO-survey." Report. Oslo: SIFO.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger (1991): *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levoke, C. and S. Wakefield (2014): "Understanding contemporary networks of environmental and social change: Complex assemblages within Canada's 'food movement'" *Environmental Politics* 23(2): 302-320.

Lictherman, P. (2002): "Seeing structure happen: theory-driven participant observation" in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Litfin, K. (2009): "Reinventing the future: The global ecovillage movement as a holistic knowledge community" in Kütting, G. and R. Lipschutz (eds): *Environmental governance: Knowledge and power in a local-global world.* London: Routledge

Kenis, A. and E. Mathijs (2014): "(De)politicizing the local: The case of the Transition Towns movement in Flanders (Belgium)." *Journal of Rural Studies* 34: 172-183.

Kennedy, E. (2011): "Rethinking ecological citizenship: the role of neighborhood networks in cultural change" *Environmental Politics* 20(6): 843-60.

Klandermans, B. and J. Smith (2002): "Survey research: A case for comparative

design" in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (2002): "Introduction" in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

KRD (2011): "Resultater for Landås i Bergen. Kommunestyrevalget." Kommunal- og regionaldepartementet. [online]. –URL: http://www.regjeringen.no/krd/html/valg2011/bk3_12_1_713.html (Retrieved 07.09.2014)

Kvale, S. (2001): *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju.* Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag

Maniates, M. (2001): "Individualization: Plant a tree, buy a bike, save the world?" *Global Environmental Politics* 1(3): 31-52.

Marlow, H., Hayes, W., Soret, S., Carter, R., Schwab, E. and J. Sabaté (2009): "Diet and the environment: does what you eat matter?" *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 89(5): 16995-17035.

Martin, D. (2013): "Place frames: analysing practice and production of place in contentious politics" in Nicholls, W., Miller, B. and J. Beaumont (eds): *Spaces of contention*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Martiniussen, E. (2013): *Drivhuseffekten – klimapolitikken som forsvant*. Oslo: Manifest forlag

McAdam, D. (1985): *Political process and the development of black insurgency 1930-70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McNeill, D. (1999): "On interdisciplinary research: With particular reference to the field of environment and development". *Higher Education Quarterly* 53(4): 312-332.

McNeill, D. (2006): "The diffusion of ideas in development theory and policy". *Global Social Policy* 6(3): 334-354.

Melucci, A. (1986): *Nomads of the present.* London: Radius.

Melucci, A. (1995): "The process of collective identity", in Johnston, H. and B. Klandermans (eds): *Social movements and culture*. Minneapolis: Univeristy of Minnesota Press.

Miles, M., Huberman, A. and J. Saldana (2014): *Qualitative data analysis. A methods source book. Edition 3.* London: Sage.

Miljødirektoratet (2014a): "Faglig grunnlag for videreutvikling av den nasjonale og internasjonale klimapolitikken - Klimatiltak mot 2020 og plan for videre arbeid. " Report M133/2014. Oslo: Miljødirektoratet.

Miljødirektoratet (2014b): "Kunnskapsgrunnlag for lavutslippsutvikling" Report M229/2014. Oslo: Miljødirektoratet.

Monbiot, G. (2006): *Heat: How to stop the planet burning.* London: Allen Lane

Moses, J. and T. Knutsen (2007): *Ways of knowing. Competing methodologies in social and political research.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

NNV (2014): "Årsmelding 2012." Oslo: Naturvernforbundet. [online]. –URL: http://naturvernforbundet.no/getfile.php/Dokumenter/Organisasjon%20-%20%C3%A5rsmeldinger%2C%20styrende%20dokumenter%20etc/Naturvernforbundet%20%C3%A5rsmelding%202012.pdf (Retrieved 05.11.2014).

Nordgaard, K. (2011): *Living in denial: Climate change, emotions and everyday life*. Cambridge: MIT Press

Nordgaard, R. and L. Sharachchandra (2005): "Practicing interdisciplinarity." *BioScience* 55(11): 967-975.

Norges Røde Kors (2014): "Årsrapport 2013. " Oslo: Røde Kors. [online]. –URL: https://www.rodekors.no/Global/HK/Media/Rapporter/aarsrapport_2013_web.pdf?epslanguage=no (Retrieved 05.11.2014).

North, P. (2011): "The politics of climate activism in th UK: A social movement analysis." *Environment and Planning* 43: 1581-1598.

Oberschall, A. (1973): *Social conflict and social movement.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Olson, M. (1965): *The logic of collective action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Oslo kommune (2011): "Valg 2011. Valgoppgjør for Bydel Sagene". [online]. –URL: http://www.valg.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/Valg%20%28VALG%29/Internett%20%28VALG%29/Dokumenter/Resultater%20-%20Kommunestyrevalg%20og%20bydelsutvalg%202011/eCounting%20-%2003%20Bydel%20Sagene.pdf (Retrieved 08.09.2014).

Overton , J. and P. van Diermen (2003): "Using quantitative techniques" in Schevyens, R. and D. Storey (eds): *Development fieldwork. A practical guide.* London: Sage Publications.

Princen, T., Maniates, M. and K. Conca (2002): "Confronting Consumption" in

Princen, T., Maniates, M. and K. Conca (eds): *Confronting consumption*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Reckwitz, A. (2002): "Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing". *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(2): 243-263

Reeves, A., Lemon, M. and D. Cook (2013): "Jump-starting transition? Catalysing grassroots action on climate change." *Energy Efficiency* 7: 115-132

Robinson, J. (1996): "Falling between schools. Some thoughts on the theory and practice of interdisciplinarity" in Hearn, A. and L. Salter (eds): *Outside the lines. Issues in interdisciplinary research*. Quebec: McGill-Queens University Press

Rutland, T. (2013): "Energizing environmental concern in Portland, Oregon" in Nicholls, W., Miller, B. and J. Beaumont (eds): *Spaces of contention*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Karlstrøm, H., Ryghaug, M. and K. Sørensen (2013): "Towards new national policy instruments for promoting energy efficiency". Working Paper. Trondheim: Department for the interdisciplinary study of culture, NTNU.

Ryghaug, M., Sørensen, K., and R. Næss (2011): "Making sense of global warming: Norwegians appropriating knowledge of anthropogenic climate change." *Public Understanding of Science* 20(6): 778-795.

Sagene Bydel (2014): "Strategisk plan for bydel Sagene 2014-2016". Oslo: Bydel Sagene. [online]. –URL: http://www.bydel-sagene.oslo.kommune.no/getfile.php/bydel%20sagene%20%28BSA%29/Internett%20%28BSA%29/Dokumenter/dokument/planer_og_rapporter/STRATEGISK%20PLAN%202014-2016.pdf (Retrieved 29.08.2014)

Sahakian, M. and H. Wilhite (2014): "Making practice theory practicable: Towards more sustainable forms of consumption." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(1): 25-44.

Scott, A. (1990): *Ideology and the new social movements.* London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.

Seyfang, G. and A. Haxeltine (2012): "Growing grassroots innovations: Exploring the role of community-based social movements for sustainable energy transitions". *Environment and planning: Government and policy* 30: 381-400.

Seyfang, G. and Smith, A. (2007) "Grassroots Innovations for Sustainable Development: Towards a new research and policy agenda." *Environmental Politics* 16(4): 584-683.

Seyfang, G., Haxeltine, A., Hargreaves, T. and N. Longhurst (2010): "Energy and communities in transition – towards a new research agenda on agency and civil society in sustainability transitions". CSERGE Working Paper 2010/13. Norwich: The Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, University of East Anglia.

Shove, E., Lutzenhiser, L., Guy, S., Hackett, B. and H. Wilhite (1998): "Energy and social systems" in Rayner, S. and E. Malone (eds): *Human choice and climate change*. Ohio: Battelle Press.

Shove, E. and G. Walker (2010): "Governing transitions in the sustainability of everyday life." *Research Policy* 39(4): 471-476

Shove, E. (2012): "Habits and their creatures" in Warde, A. and D. Southerton (eds): *The habits of consumption*. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

Shove, E., Pantzar, M. and M. Watson (2012): *The Dynamics of Social Practice*: *Everyday Life and how it Changes.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Smith, A. (2011): "The Transition Town Network: A review of current evolutions and renaissance". *Social movement studies: Journal of social, cultural and political protest* 10(1): 99-105.

Smith, A. (2012): "Civil society in sustainable energy transitions" in Verbong, G. and D. Loorbach (eds): *Governing the energy transition: reality, illusion or necessity.* New York: Routledge. [online]. –URL: https://grassrootsinnovations.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/smith-2011-civil-society-in-energy-transitions-in-ksi-energy-transitions-book.pdf (Retrieved 03.03.2014)

SNF (2014): "Verksamhetsberättelse 2012-2013." Protokoll 2/14. Stockholm: Naturskyddsforeningen. [online]. –URL: http://www.naturskyddsforeningen.se/sites/default/files/dokument-media/foreningsdokument/Verksamhetsber%C3%A4ttelse_2012-2013_S_Protokoll_2-14_bilaga_2.pdf (Retrieved 05.11.2014)

Snow, D. and D. Trom (2002): "The case study and the study of social movements" in Klandermans, B. and S. Staggenborg (eds): *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Snow, D., Rochford. R., Worden, S. and R. Benford (1986): "Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation." American Sociological Review 51: 464-481.

Solheim, E. (2013): *Politikk er å ville.* Oslo: Cappelen Damm

Spaargaren, G. (2013): "The cultural dimension of sustainable consumption practices: an exploration in theory and policy" in Cohen, M., Brown, H. and P. Vergrargt (eds): *Innovations in sustainable consumption. New economics, socio-technical transitions and social practices.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing limited.

SSB (2014): "Utslipp av klimagasser, 2013, foreløpige tall." [online]. –URL: http://www.ssb.no/klimagassn/ (Retrieved 06.06.2014).

Steen-Johnsen, K. and B. Enjolras (2011): "Norway: Towards a volatile civil society?" in Wijkström, F. and A. Zimmer (eds): *Nordic civil society at a cross-roads: Transforming the popular movement tradition*. Baden-baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft

Stephenson, J., Barton, B., Carrington, G., Gnoth, D., Lawson, R. and P. Thorsnes (2010): "Energy cultures: A framework for understanding energy behaviours." Energy Policy 38(10): 6120-6129.

Stern, N. (2007): "Stern review on the economics of climate change". London: HM Treasury and Cabinet Office.

St.meld nr 21 (2011-2012) (2011): St. meld. Nr 21 (2011–2012). *Norsk Klimapolitikk.* Oslo: Miljøverndepartementet.

Swensen, E. (2012): "Tid for ei revitalisering av miljøengasjementet." *Tvergastein. Interdisciplinary Journal of the Environment* 1: 19-23. [online]. –URL: http://tvergasteinjournal.wordpress.com/2012/05/24/issue-1/

TNS Gallup (2013): "TNS Gallups Klimabarometer 2013" [online]. –URL: file:///C:/Users/ins/Downloads/TNS%20Gallup%20presenterer%20resultater%20fra%20Klimabarometeret%202013%20p%C3%A5%20Litteraturhuset%207.%20juni%202013.pdf (Retrieved 02.05.2014).

Touraine, A. (1981): *The voice and the eye: An analysis of social movements.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Transition Network (2013a): "What is a Transition Initiative?" [online]. -URL: http://www.transitionnetwork.org/support/what-transition-initiative (Retrieved 19.12.2013).

Transition Network (2013b): "Transition Initiatives Directory?" [online]. -URL: http://www.transitionnetwork.org/initiatives (Retrieved 19.12.2013).

Trapese (2008): "The rocky road to a real transition: The transition town movement and what it means for social change." Report. Trapese popular education collective. [online] –URL: http://trapese.clearerchannel.org/resources/rocky-road-a5-web.pdf (Retrieved 25.02.2014).

Warde, A. and D. Southerton (2012): "Introduction" in Warde, A. and D. Southerton (eds): *The habits of consumption*. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

Wenger, E. (1998): *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Westskog, H., Winther, T. and E. Strumse (2011): "Adressing fields of rationality: A policy for reducing household energy consumption?" in Galarraga, I., Gonzalez-Eguino, M. and A. Markandya (eds): *Handbook of sustainable energy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Wilhite, H. (2008): *Consumption and the transformation of everyday life. A view from South India.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilhite, H. (2012): "The energy dilemma" in Bjørkdahl, K. and K. Nielsen: *Development and environment: Practices, theories, policies*. Oslo: Unipub.

Wilhite, H. (2014): "Sustainability as a social practice. New perspectives on the theory and policies of reducing energy consumption" in Lockie, S., Sonnenfeld, D. and D. Fisher: *Routledge international handbook of social and environmental change*. New York: Routledge.

Wilhite, H. and J. Norgard (2004): "Equating efficiency with reduction: A self-deception in energy policy." *Energy and Environment* 15(3): 991-1011.

Wilhite, H., Shove, E., Lutzenhiser, L. and W. Kempton (2000): "The legacy of twenty years of energy demand management: We know more about individual behavior but next to nothing about demand." in Jochem, E., Sathaye, J. and D. Bouille (eds): *Society, behaviour and climate change mitigation*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Xia, T., Zhang, Y., Crabb, S. and P. Shah (2013): "Cobenefits of replacing car trips with alternative transportation: A review of evidence and methodological issues" *Journal of Environmental and Public Health* [online] –URL: http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jeph/2013/797312/ (Retrieved 08.11.2014).

Yin, R. (2009): *Case study research. Design and methods. Fourth edition*. California: SAGE Inc.

Appendices

Appendix I: Lists of interviews

Bærekraftige Liv på Landås

#nr	*Sex*	*Place of interview*	*Date*	*Length, min*	*Comment*	*Capacity*
1	Female	Workplace	04.02.2014	80	Interviewed together with #2	Initiator
2	Female	Workplace	04.02.2014	80	Interviewed together with #1	Initiator
3	Male	Workplace	04.02.2014	55		Initiator
4	Female	At home	09.02.2014	50	Interviewed together with #5	Participant
5	Male	At home	09.02.2014	50	Interviewed together with #4	Participant
6	Male	At home	09.02.2014	75		Participant
7	Female	Workplace	04.02.2014	55		Participant
8	Female	At home	03.02.2014	60		Participant
9	Female	At home	09.02.2014	70		Participant

Omstilling Sagene

#nr	*Sex*	*Place of interview*	*Date*	*Length, min*	*Comment*	*Capacity*
10	Female	At home	17.02.2014	75		Initator
11	Female	At home	18.02.2014	80		Initator
12	Male	At home	19.02.2014	100		Initator
13	Female	At home	13.02.2014	55		Participant
14	Female	Café	24.02.2014	50		Participant
15	Female	Café	31.01.2014	50		Participant
16	Female	Café	07.02.2014	55		Participant

Appendix II: List of informal conversations noted in the text

Bærekraftige Liv på Landås

#nr	Sex	Place of interview	Date	Length, minutes	Comment	Capacity
17	Female	At meeting	21.01.2014	5		Participant
18	Male	At meeting	21.01.2014	15		Participant
19	Male	At meeting	21.01.2014	10		Participant

Omstilling Sagene

#nr	Sex	Place of interview	Date	Length, minutes	Comment	Capacity
20	Female	At meeting	12.12.2013	10		Participant

During the course of participant observation in the groups, I had numerous conversations with participants. For pragmatic reasons all are not recorded here, but I chose to note down the ones which I explicitly refer to in the text.

Appendix III: Interview guide

1) **Motivation**

- How did you discover Omstilling Sagene (OS)/Bærekraftige Liv på Landås (BLL)?
- Why did you join?
- Why are you still part of the group?
- How do you feel about participating in activities organized by OS/BLL?

2) **Personal development/change**

- Has your participation changed anything in you personally or in your life?
- Have you gained new knowledge on any matters?
- Have you developed any new practical skills? If yes, do you often apply them?
- Have you changed any habits? If yes, in what way?
- Have you changed your pattern of consumption – in that case in what way?
- Have you changed your attitudes?

3) **Change in the local community**

- In your experience, has OS/BLL changed Sagene/Landås? If yes, in what way? If no, why not?
- In your experience, has OS/BLL had any power of influence beyond the local community? If yes, in what way? If no, why not?
- Do you think that OS/BLL can contribute to change for other places/on a larger geographical scale? If yes, how? If no, why not?

4) **Political understanding**

- Have you been active in politics or organisational matters before? If yes: what kind? If no: why not?
- How is OS/BLL any different from the more established environmental movement?

- How would you describe the others who are in OS/BLL?
- Do you think that OS/BLL can have any political influence? Is that desirable or not?

5) Strategies

- Do you have any visions or desires for OS/BLL?
- Do you wish to see other neighbourhoods start up similar initiatives? Does OS/BLL play any role in facilitating this?
- How do you work to reach more people?
- In your opinion, how does the organization and leadership of OS/BLL work?
- How are new activities initiated?
- Have there been internal disagreements in the group regarding which path OS/BLL should go?
- What are the greatest challenges for OS/BLL in your view?
- What are the greatest opportunities for OS/BLL in your view?

6) Self-perception

- Would you characterize yourself as an environmentally conscious person?
- Do you participate in OS/BLL mostly because you worry about global challenges, or out of local considerations?
- Do you think that what you do on a local level can make a difference globally? If yes, how? If no, why not?
- What do you think is needed to change our communities to develop in a more sustainable direction?
- Do you think that individuals can make a difference in the larger systems that we are a part of?

7) Practice/habits

- Do you ride a bicycle to work or school?
- Do you take the bus instead of the car?
- Do you often buy organic or locally farmed food?

- Do you often buy second-hand instead of new, or do you use exchange/lending services?
- Do you cultivate your own food?
- Do you repair or redesign old clothes?
- Do you have any other habits, or do you perform any other acts that you consider environmentally friendly?
- Do you do anything of the above more often now than before you joined OS/BLL? If yes, why? If no, why not?

8) Miscellaneous

- Would you like to add something?

Interviews were both conducted in Norwegian and English. I also recorded the age and sex of the interviewees, for how long they had participated in the group as well as their role in the group.

Appendix IV: Information given prior to interviews

Request for participation in the research project "The potential of social innovation for energy transitions"

Background and object
Master thesis at the Centre for Development and the Environment (SUM), University of Oslo. The thesis will study two Norwegian initiatives that are part of the international Transition Movement: Omstilling Sagene (OS) in Oslo and Bærekraftige Liv på Landås (BLL) in Bergen. The thesis will explore demographical variables of the individuals participating, how the initiatives work, what they have achieved in their local communities, what their challenges are, the motivation of the participants, and thoughts and plans regarding the initiatives.

What does participating in the study involve?
You will be participating as one of the 15-20 people that I interview about their motivation for participating in, and their thoughts surrounding, the initiative. I will be interviewing approximately ten persons in each initiative and particate myself in activities of the groups. I will also use data from a survey conducted by Telemark Research Institute (TIR) within BLL, as well as similar survey that I will conduct in cooperation with TIR in OS.

What will happen to the information collected about you?
All personal data will be treated confidentially. Only I and my supervisor at SUM will have access to the information.

In the thesis to be published, I will use the names of the groups, but anonymize the names of the informants. If relevant, I will describe characteristics of the informants, like gender, age and profession, or whether the person has an active and central role in the initiative. That means that if you grant me permission to do so, you might be recognized by other members of the group or people very familiar with the group.

The project is initially supposed to be finalized September 1st 2014. At the end of the project the identifying codes of the data material will be erased, through deletion of name lists. Sound recordings will also be deleted. The data material will however not be anonymized as information indirectly identifying persons, like role in the group, profession, age e.g. will be described in the thesis.

Voluntary participation
Participating in the study is voluntary, and you can retract your approval at any time without stating a reason. If you do withdraw, all information about you will be anonymized.

The study is reported to Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.

Consent to participate in the study will be obtained verbally.

Contact information:
Ingerid Salvesen, masters student
Phone: 99002920
E-mail: ingeridbs.salvesen@gmail.com

Harold Wilhite, supervisor and professor at Centre for Development and the Environment, Univeristy of Oslo
Phone: 22858924
E-mail: h.l.wilhite@sum.uio.no

Appendix V: Activities where I participated and observed

Date	Description
30.10.2013	Meeting in Activities-working group, Omstilling Sagene
31. 10.2013	Fermentation workshop, Omstilling Sagene
03.11.2013	Meeting between Omstilling Sagene and Omstilling Nesodden
03. 11.2013	Monthly café, Omstilling Sagene
28. 11.2013	Exchange market, Omstilling Sagene
01. 12.2013	Meeting of the different working groups, Omstilling Sagene
01. 12.2013	Monthly café, Omstilling Sagene
08. 12.2013	Cider brewing workshop, Omstilling Sagene
13. 01.2014	Meeting in Activities-working group, Omstilling Sagene
14. 01.2014	Meeting in Facilitating-group, Omstilling Sagene
18. 01.2014	"Wealth is to share", workshop on alternative economy, Omstilling Sagene

21. 01.2014	Meeting for all participants, Bærekraftige Liv på Landås
28. 01.2014	Meeting Food Growing-group, Omstilling Sagene
02.02.2014	Monthly café, Omstilling Sagene
03. 02.2014	Meeting between BLL and other TM-groups in Bergen
07. 02.2014	Inspiration night for bikers, Omstilling Sagene
23. 02.2014	Exchange market, Omstilling Sagene
27. 02.2014	Climate conference: BLL held a presentation.
03. 03.2014	Meeting for all participants, OS
06.03.2014	Church of Oslo inspiration night: OS held a presentation

Appendix VI: Survey for Omstilling Sagene

The survey is more or less similar to the one performed within Bærekraftige Liv på Landås by Telemark Research Institute, although it is adapted to the local context of Sagene. Also, I added the following three questions relevant for my thesis:

1) Question 6 was included in order to be able to categorize people according to how long they have been a part of the groups, and subsequently find out whether length of participation affects other variables.
2) Question 19 was included to examine which mobilization strategies that are most successful.
3) Question 24 was included to secure one additional variable to categorize participants, and to examine a common criticism attributed to environmental initiatives, namely that it only engages highly educated people .

The survey is here presented as it was presented to participants, and is consequently in Norwegian. An English translation will be available upon request. For considerations of space, the results for each question will not be included here. They will also be provided upon request.

Deltakelse i "Omstilling Sagene"

1. Hvilke aktiviteter har du vært med på i regi av "Omstilling Sagene"? (Flere svaralternativ er mulig)

(1) ❑ Matdyrking
(2) ❑ Filmvisning
(3) ❑ Dugnad (Tilhengerhagen, Permakultur-installasjonene etc)
(4) ❑ Kurs i praktiske ferdigheter (sykkelverksted, sykurs, meitemarkkompostering etc)
(5) ❑ Matlagingskurs (melkesyregjæring, cider-/ølbrygging, surdeigbrød etc)
(6) ❑ Høsting av naturen (nyttevekstvandring, sopp-/bærplukking etc)
(7) ❑ Omstillingskafé / fellesmøter /fellesturer

(8) ❑ Park(ing) Day / Bydelsdagen

(9) ❑ ”Rikdom er å dele” / Lets.no

(10) ❑ Byttemarked

(11) ❑ Sommerfest

(12) ❑ Planleggingsmøter

(13) ❑ Andre. Hvilke? _____

(14) ❑ Ingen aktiviteter

2. I hvilket omfang har du deltatt på aktiviteter i Omstilling Sagene?

(1) ❑ Mange aktiviteter

(2) ❑ Noen aktiviteter

(3) ❑ Få aktiviteter

3. Skulle du gjerne deltatt på flere arrangementer?

(1) ❑ Ja

(2) ❑ Nei

(3) ❑ Vet ikke

4. Hva er grunnen til at du ikke deltar på flere aktiviteter? (Flere svaralternativ er mulig)

(1) ❑ Har ikke tid

(2) ❑ Møtene/aktivitetene
er lagt til tider/dager som ikke passer for meg

(3) ❑ Aktivitetene
interesserer meg ikke

(4) ❑ Bor for langt
unna

(5) ❑ Annet, hva
da? _____

5. Har du vært med å arrangere aktiviteter i regi av "Omstilling Sagene ", og i tilfellet hvilke? (Flere svaralternativ er mulig)

(1) ❑ Matdyrking

(2) ❑ Filmvisning

(3) ❑ Dugnad (Tilhengerhagen, Permakultur-installasjonene etc)

(4) ❑ Kurs i praktiske ferdigheter (sykkelverksted, sykurs, meitemarkkompostering etc)

(5) ❑ Matlagingskurs (melkesyregjæring,cider-/ølbrygging, surdeigbrød etc)

(6) ❑ Høsting av naturen (nyttevekstvandring, sopp-/bærplukking etc)

(7) ❑ Omstillingskafé / fellesmøter /fellesturer

(8) ❑ Park(ing) Day / Bydelsdagen

(9) ❑ ”Rikdom er å dele” / Lets.no

(10) ❑ Byttemarked

(11) ❑ Sommerfest

(12) ❑ Planleggingsmøter

(13) ❑ Andre. Hvilke? _____

(14) ❑ Ikke vært med å arrangere

6. Hvor lenge har du deltatt på aktiviteter i regi av ”Omstilling Sagene”?

(1) ❑ Mer eller mindre siden oppstarten

(2) ❑ 2-3 år

(3) ❑ 1-2 år

(4) ❑ Blitt med i løpet av det siste året

Motiver for deltakelse i "Omstilling Sagene"

7. Hvor viktig er følgende motiver for din deltakelse på aktiviteter i regi av "Omstilling Sagene"? Svar på en skala fra 1-6, der 1 er ikke viktig og 6 er svært viktig.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Ønske om et sosialt fellesskap rundt miljøaktiviteter	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om et sosialt felleskap i bydelen	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Bekymring for klimaendringene	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om økonomiske gevinster gjennom å lære mer om miljø-/energitiltak	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om å gjøre noe positivt for miljøet	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om å drive med utendørsaktiviteter i nærmiljøet	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om få mer kunnskap om hvordan jeg kan leve et mer miljøvennlig liv	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Ønske om å skape en sterkere identitet til stedet der jeg bor	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Ønske om å påvirke andre i lokalsamfunnet til et mer miljøvennlig levesett	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Annet	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

8. Hvilke andre motiver har vært viktige for din deltakelse på aktiviteter i regi av "Omstilling Sagene"?

Holdninger

9. Hvor enig eller uenig er du i følgende påstander? Svar på en skala fra 1-6 der 1 er helt uenig og 6 er helt enig.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Globale utfordringer er viktig for mitt lokale engasjement	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg setter hensynet til andre foran egne ønsker	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Vi bør løse problemer i eget land før vi hjelper andre	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Smaken er viktigere enn hvor maten kommer fra	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg er opptatt av å leve sundt og holde meg i form	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mitt lokale engasjement vil kunne utgjøre en forskjell globalt	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Det er ingen motsetning mellom redusert forbruk og økt livskvalitet	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Forbruket må reduseres for å	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
bevare naturressursene							
Økonomisk vekst må prioriteres foran naturvern	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Klimakrisen kan ikke løses lokalt. Det må nasjonale og internasjonale politikere ta segav	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Miljøsituasjonen er katastrofal/kritisk, øyeblikkelige drastiske tiltak er nødvendig	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Politikere bør prioritere miljø i langt sterkere grad	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg ønsker å redusere mitt forbruk for å utjevne forskjellene mellom fattige og rike	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg føler ikke noe ansvar for forbruksvekst og klimakrise	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg synes det er meningsfylt å dyrke lokal mat	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg tror det er en sammenheng mellom forbruksvekst og klimakrisen	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

Holdningsendringer

10. I hvilken grad har din deltakelse i "Omstilling Sagene" bidratt til at du har fått økt bevissthet rundt følgende tema? Svar på en skala fra 1-6, der 1 er ikke i det hele tatt og 6 er i svært stor grad.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Globale klimautfordringer	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Behov og muligheter for energiøkonomisering	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Betydningen av lokalt miljøengasjement	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Lokale miljøtiltak og effekter av disse	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Behovet for en bærekraftig utvikling lokalt	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Håp og tro på en bærekraftig framtid	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Tro på at jeg selv og mitt nettverk kan utgjøre en forskjell	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg har blitt mer positiv til å dele ting i lokale nettverk (f.eks. tilhenger)	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

Handlinger

11. Hvor enig eller uenig er du i følgende påstander? Svar på en skala fra 1-6 der 1 er helt uenig og 6 er helt enig.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Jeg kjøper økologisk og kortreist mat så fremt det er mulig	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg bruker ofte bil på korte strekninger	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg sykler ofte til og fra jobb	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg bruker sjelden sykkel på fritiden	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg bruker stort sett fly i forbindelse med feriereiser	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg bruker sjelden fly i forbindelse med lengre	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
jobbreiser							
Jeg reiser kollektivt dersom det er mulig	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg kjøper brukt i stedet for nytt	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg driver ikke med resirkulering/gjenbruk	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg har gode energiøkonomiske løsninger og tiltak i min bolig	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Jeg dyrker egen mat	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

Handlingsendringer

12. I hvilken grad har din deltakelse i "Omstilling Sagene" bidratt til følgende handlingsendringer hos deg selv? Svar på en skala fra 1-6, der 1 er ikke i det hele tatt og 6 er i svært stor grad.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Mer bruk av energiøkonomiske løsninger og tiltak i egen bolig	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer miljøvennlig forbruk generelt sett	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer bruk av økologisk og kortreist mat	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer bruk av miljøvennlig transport	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer dyrking av egen mat	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer bruk av sykkel	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer resirkulering og gjenbruk	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer samkjøring med bil til jobb og fritidsaktiviteter	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mindre antall flyreiser	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Vet ikke
Mer tilbøyelig til å gi bort ting jeg ikke trenger lenger, framfor å kaste det.	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer deltakelse på aktiviteter på Sagene	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer drivstoffgjerrig kjørestil	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer forbruk av produkter med lang levetid framfor lav pris	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑
Mer reparasjon framfor kasting	(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑	(7) ❑

Bakgrunnsspørsmål

13. Hvor gammel er du?

(1) ❑ Under 20
(2) ❑ 20-24
(3) ❑ 25-29
(4) ❑ 30-39
(5) ❑ 40-49
(6) ❑ 50-59
(7) ❑ 60-69
(8) ❑ 70+

14. Kjønn?

(1) ❑ Mann
(2) ❑ Kvinne

15. Er du etnisk norsk?

(1) ❑ Ja
(2) ❑ Nei

16. Hvis etnisk norsk, har du bodd i utlandet i mer enn 6 måneder?

(1) ❑ Ja
(2) ❑ Nei
(3) ❑ Nei, men jeg har reist mye i store deler av verden

17. Bor du i Sagene bydel?

(1) ❑ Ja

(2) ❑ Nei, men i nærområdet

(3) ❑ Nei

18. Hvis du ikke bor på Sagene, er du interessert i omstillingsaktiviteter der du bor?

(1) ❑ Ja

(2) ❑ Ja, men ikke i å starte dem

(3) ❑ Nei

19. Hvordan oppdaget du Omstilling Sagene?

(1) ❑ Venner/kjente

(2) ❑ Sosiale medier

(3) ❑ Deltok på et arrangement de sto bak

(4) ❑ Fysisk endring i nærområdet (dyrket hageflekk, tilhengerhage etc)

(5) ❑ Medieoppslag

(6) ❑ Plakat i nærområdet

(7) ❑ Annet. Hva da? _____

20. I hvilken grad vil du karakterisere deg som et aktivt medlem i lag og frivillige organisasjoner? Svar på en skala fra 1-6 der 1 er "ikke i det hele tatt" og 6 er "i svært stor grad".

1	2	3	4	5	6
(1) ❑	(2) ❑	(3) ❑	(4) ❑	(5) ❑	(6) ❑

21. Vil du stort sett beskrive deg selv som meget, ganske, ikke spesielt eller slett ikke lykkelig?

(1) ❑ Meget lykkelig

(2) ❑ Ganske lykkelig

(3) ❑ Ikke spesielt lykkelig

(4) ❑ Slett ikke lykkelig

22. Hvilket politisk parti stemte du ved forrige kommunevalg?

(1) ❑ Rødt

(2) ❑ SV

(3) ❑ AP

(4) ❑ Miljøpartiet de grønne
(5) ❑ SP
(6) ❑ V
(7) ❑ KRF
(8) ❑ H
(9) ❑ FRP
(10) ❑ Andre
(11) ❑ Vet ikke

23. Hva er husstandens samlede brutto inntekt?

(1) ❑ Under 250 000
(2) ❑ 251 000 - 500 000
(3) ❑ 501 000 - 750 000
(4) ❑ 751 000 - 1000 000
(5) ❑ Over 1000 000

24. Hvilken utdanning har du?

(1) ❑ Grunnskole
(2) ❑ Videregående skole/gymnas/fagbrev
(3) ❑ Bachelorgrad/mellomfag, universitet/høyskole
(4) ❑ Mastergrad/hovedfag, universitet/høyskole
(5) ❑ PhD eller høyere

2b. Hva er grunnen til at du så langt ikke har deltatt på aktiviteter i Omstilling Sagene?

(1) ❑ Har ikke tid
(2) ❑ Møtene/aktivitetene er lagt til tider/dager som ikke passer for meg
(3) ❑ Aktivitetene interesserer meg ikke
(4) ❑ Bor for langt unna
(5) ❑ Annet, hva da? _____

3b. Ønsker du å delta på aktiviteter i framtiden?

(1) ❑ Ja

(2) ❑ Nei

(3) ❑ Vet ikke

4b. Hvorfor er du interessert i Omstilling Sagene?